DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 663 95 CE 003 267

AUTHOR	Beder, Harold W.; Darkenwald, Gordon G.
TITLE	Development, Demonstration, and Dissemination: Case Studies of Selected Specific Projects in Adult Basic Education. Occasional Paper No. 42.
INSTITUTION	Syracuse Univ., N.Y. Publications Program in Continuing Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Adult Education.
REPORT NO	Occasional Paper-42
PUB DATE	Nov 74
GRANT	OEG-0-71-4411(323)
NOTE	62p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications in Continuing Education, Syracuse University, 224 Huntington Hall, Syracuse, New York 13210 ($2.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Case Studies (Education); Demonstration Projects; *Experimental Programs; *Federal Aid; *Information Dissemination; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Adult Education Act Section 309 (b)

ABSTRACT

In an effort to determine the effectiveness of 309 (b) projects (experimental demonstration projects in Adult Basic Education funded through the Adult Education Act), selected projects were used as the basis for several case studies and evaluated. Project RFD was never intended to be utilized by Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs but instead demonstrates alternatives to current practices. Project Communi-Link was a model demonstration project in many ways, but its effectiveness outside the original pilot communities is doubted. The Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory (SWCEL) ABE project for the Mexican-American community developed products of high technical quality, but local ABE programs have not used them in proportion to the investment. The Texas guidance and counseling project to improve ABE counseling developed a product which has been used extensively in Region 6, but the project was unable to carry out successful dissemination efforts outside the region. Three local impact cases (Chinatown English Language Center, Lumbee Adult Education Project, and Program for the Spanish-Speaking Community) did not involve dissemination of outcomes because of their operational orientation. The case studies demonstrate a need for a permanent dissemination system to take full advantage of the monies, time, and effort invested. (AG)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED103663

OCCASIONAL PAPERS • NUMBER 42

DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND DISSEMINATION: CASE STUDIES OF SELECTED SPECIFIC PROJECTS IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

By: HAROLD W. BEDER and
GORDON G. DARKENWALD

Syracuse University
PUBLICATIONS IN CONTINUING EDUCATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CE003267

A Publication in Continuing Education
Syracuse University

David R. Krathwohl, Dean, School of Education
Alexander N. Charters, Professor of Adult Education
Doris S. Chertow, Director, Publications in Continuing Education

This study was supported by grant OEG-0-71-4411 (323), Division of Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the policy or position of the U.S. Office of Education.

DEC 6 1974

With Our Compliments

DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND DISSEMINATION: CASE STUDIES OF SELECTED SPECIFIC PROJECTS IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

by
Harold W. Beder
Assistant Professor
Rutgers University New Jersey

and
Gordon G. Darkenwald
Assistant Professor
Teachers College Columbia University

November 1974

Syracuse University
Publications in Continuing
Education

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

A special series devoted to documents which, though prepared in a specific context and for a limited audience, are judged to be of such general interest that they merit wider distribution than that for which they were originally intended. They are presented in the hope that they will contribute to the more general sharing of information and opinion about questions of importance in the field of adult education.

This Occasional Paper may be secured for $2.75 per copy by writing:

Publications in Continuing Education
Syracuse University
224 Huntington Hall
Syracuse, New York 13210

For information about standing orders, please write to the above address.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Beder, Harold W.
Development, demonstration, and dissemination.

(Occasional papers - Syracuse University, Publications in Continuing Education ; no. 42)

1. Adult education--Case studies. I. Darkenwald, Gordon Gerald, 1906- joint author. II. Title. III. Series: Syracuse University. Publications in Continuing Education. Occasional Papers ; no. 42.
LC5215.B32 374 74-23656
ISBN 0-87060-067-2

FOREWORD

Many individuals contributed toward making this study possible. We would like first of all to acknowledge the generous assistance of the directors and staff members of the following Special Projects: Communi-Link, at Colorado State University; RFD, University of Wisconsin at Madison; Texas Guidance and Counseling, University of Texas at Austin; the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory ABE Project in Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Chinatown English Language Center, New York City; the Lumbee Regional Development Association Adult Education Project, Pembroke, North Carolina; and the Program for the Spanish-Speaking Community of the Washington, D.C. public school system.

We owe a special debt to two of our colleagues: Aliza K. Adelman, who assisted the authors in the original research, and Jack Mezirow, who directed the overall project of which this study was one component. Both colleagues worked closely with us throughout the duration of the original investigation. Alice M. Frederick, of S.U. Publications in Continuing Education, typed the camera-ready manuscript and helped with copy-editing.

Harold W. Beder
Gordon G. Darkenwald
September 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1
Background of the Research 1

II. Project RFD: Using T.V. to Reach Undereducated Rural Adults 2
The Mediated System 4
Home Study Materials 5
Home Visitors 7
Actior Line 8
The RFD Almanac 8
The RFD Newsletter 8
Issues 9
Dissemination 10
Conclusion 12

III. Project Communi-Link: A System for Community-Wide Involvement in Program Development 12
Project Objectives 13
The Basic Process 13
Microville 14
Overview of Project Operations 15
Organizational Context 16
Dissemination 17
Conclusion 19

IV. SWCEL: R & D Products for the Mexican-American Community 20
Project Objectives 20
Project Operations 22
Project Output 23
Instructional Materials 23
Teacher Training Materials 23
Miscellaneous Materials and Services 24
Dissemination 24
Table 1: Sales Data for SWCEL ABE Materials for the Period January 1971-January 1972 27
Conclusion 28

V. Texas Guidance and Counseling: An Approach to Improving ABE Counseling 29
The Package 31
Dissemination 32
Impact 34
Factors in Dissemination 36
Conclusion 37

VI. Local Impact Projects: A Comparison of Three Cases 38
Table 2: Percentage of 309 (b) Local Impact Projects Funded, 1967-1973 39
The Chinatown English Language Center 39
The Lumbee Adult Education Project 40
Program for the Spanish-Speaking Community 41
Generic Factors 42

VII. Issues and Lessons 45
A Dissemination Strategy Should Fit the Product to Be Disseminated 45
Table 3: Dissemination Strategies Used by 309 Projects Studied 46
The Problem of Focus 48
The Problem of Relevance 49
The Problem of Continuity 49
Cost of Adoption 49
Trialability and Divisibility 50
Modifiability 51
Motivation and Ability to Disseminate 51

VIII. What Needs to Be Done: A Permanent Dissemination System 52

INTRODUCTION

In the last decade the field of adult basic education (ABE) has experienced rapid growth and development, a situation largely attributable to the advent of federal funding, first from Title IIb of the Economic Opportunity Act and then from the Adult Education Act of 1966. A national program for educating adults with less than an eighth grade education was a new and ambitious undertaking; framers of the Adult Education Act therefore included Section 309 (b) authorizing the Commissioner of Education to allocate between 10 and 20 percent of all monies appropriated to ABE for special experimental and demonstration projects. Section 309 (b) states that the purpose of these projects is to:

> (1) involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials which the Commissioner determines may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this title or
>
> (2) involve programs of adult education...(that) have unusual promise in promoting comprehensive or coordinated approaches to the problems of persons with basic educational deficiencies.

Between 1967 and 1974 expenditure for such experimental demonstration projects, popularly known as 309 (b) projects, has amounted to a substantial governmental investment totaling $48,082,569.

Projects funded through 309 (b) have little intrinsic value; their worth depends on their ability to improve the practice of adult education, a benefit which can only occur if the outcomes of 309 (b) are in some way utilized by others. For utilization to occur, however, effective dissemination of 309 (b) output must take place. Given this truism, it seems important for adult educators to understand the reasons for the successes and failures of 309 (b) dissemination, an objective to which the following case studies are addressed.

Background of the Research

In 1972 the Center for Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, received a USOE research grant to determine if widespread utilization of 309 (b) project output was taking place, and if not, why not. In this study the authors conceptualized the 309 (b) program as a three-part social system joined by interorganizational linkages. The interdependent subsystems were the Office of Education, specifically the Division of Adult Education, the 309(b) projects themselves, and the main intended users of 309 (b) output, local ABE programs. The Office of Education determines 309 (b) funding policy: that is, what problems will be addressed by 309 (b)

projects and what institutions will receive grant awards. Staff of the 309 (b) projects conduct research, development, and demonstration activities and sometimes disseminate results; the local ABE programs are the major intended users of project outcomes.

The case materials presented here have been excerpted from the section of our research report dealing with the 309 (b) subsystem.[1] The projects were studied by analyzing documents such as reports, proposals, and evaluations; through personal interviews with project staff and others knowledgeable of the projects; and through inspection of project output, such as curriculum materials.

Each project was visited by field researchers from the Center for Adult Education. Generally, a field visit began with an interview of the project director, who was asked to describe the project's history, dissemination activities, and any problems associated with dissemination. After the initial interview, other key project staff were interviewed. When all available data had been collected from project staff, attempts were made to interview persons who were not staff members but who were familiar with the project; for example, state adult education directors, project clients, and advisory board members. The time spent in the field largely depended on the size and complexity of the project and ranged from one man-day to eleven man-days. After data had been assembled from field visits and documentary sources, they were analyzed and organized into the following case studies.

The case study approach employed here has both advantages and drawbacks. A major advantage is that they are valuable in sensitizing readers to the problems encountered by the organizations scrutinized and to possible solutions. The reader can imagine himself in the place of the organizational actors, simulate the problems encountered by them, and work through possible solutions in the abstract.

The main disadvantage is that the results of the case studies cannot, and should not, be generalized to the population as a whole, in this instance the entire 309 (b) system.

PROJECT RFD: USING TV TO REACH UNDEREDUCATED RURAL ADULTS

RFD (Rural Family Development) began operating in 1970 and was funded for three years for a total of $708,000. In general, the first

---

[1] Gordon G. Darkenwald, Harold W. Beder, and Aliza K. Adelman, Problems of Dissemination and Use of Innovations in Adult Basic Education (New York: Center for Adult Education, Columbia University, 1974).

year was spent in planning and developing television shows and materials. The demonstration was conducted in the second year, with the third year devoted to dissemination and preparation of reports. The grantee was WHA-TV, an educational television station attached to the University of Wisconsin at Madison. It has a viewing radius of about fifty miles.

As set forth in the first year proposal, the primary objective of RFD was the

> Development of a . . . rural adult basic education and continuing education demonstration research project utilizing educational television, individualized home study instruction techniques and a personalized home contact instruction and evaluation plan ....
>
> By combining these three elements, the university and State of Wisconsin propose to demonstrate a new approach to providing adult basic education courses for the rural disadvantaged.

The initial stimulus for establishing RFD was provided by a USOE "request for proposal" (RFP) which solicited projects utilizing television as an ABE delivery system. Once the RFP had been made public, a group of adult education professors and WHA-TV staff formed an ad hoc committee to develop a proposal. The committee decided that rural residents were a logical target population for a TV-based ABE program, since low population density often made it difficult to maintain conventional ABE programs in these areas. The proposal that resulted included the following objectives:

> To demonstrate the effectiveness of an integrated television, home study, home contact and visit program for the rural ABE students.
>
> To demonstrate the effectiveness of the role of mass media in rural ABE programs.
>
> To create a viable television-based, multi-media program usable in similar situations in other parts of the country.
>
> To demonstrate the effectiveness of an interdisciplinary family and community oriented approach to rural ABE programs.
>
> To involve large numbers of undereducated adults not now able or willing to participate in ABE programs.
>
> To develop a program that will improve ABE instruction while maintaining the lowest possible cost-per-pupil.

To assist in the development of skills that can lead to new careers for home study aides and other staff members.

To demonstrate involvement of disadvantaged individuals in the development and implementation of such a program.

To develop participant skills in the basic fields of communication and computation while improving the capability of the target audience to exercise citizenship responsibilities.

To develop participant skills from present proficiency towards eighth grade and twelfth grade equivalency achievement levels.

As conceived, the RFD project was to contain six integrated components--the mediated system (radio and television shows), the RFD Newsletter, home study materials, the RFD Almanac, home visitors, and the RFD Action Line. The television shows were to create awareness of RFD and its materials. Home visitors were to further reinforce use of materials. Action Line and the Almanac were to build "bridges" between the RFD staff and the participants, while the Newsletter was to be the major external dissemination device. There is some question, however, about how well this intended integration was actually achieved. In their external evaluation of RFD, the Human Factors Research Laboratory of Colorado State University stated:

> An attempt was made to integrate the components, but the integration was not effected well in the demonstration. There is little evidence that TV programs were designed to stimulate interest in materials in the content center. The home visitors and the participants we visited saw little or no connotation among the three components, except for the home visitor helping the participant obtain materials.

The Mediated System

A series of twenty television broadcasts comprised the core of the mediated system. There are indications that some of the original authors of the RFD proposal expected the television shows to constitute something of an adult Sesame Street, where television would serve as an actual vehicle for teaching basic education. In actuality, however, the shows were designed to create viewer awareness of the RFD home study materials. Little in the way of basic education was dispensed via television. A TV segment viewed by the researchers, for example, included instruction on how to fix a screen door and featured Andy Williams telling of his

boyhood experiences in West Virginia.

At the outset, one problem encountered by the WHA-TV staff was that its intended viewers, undereducated rural adults, were not generally a part of the educational television audience. To overcome this problem, the project conducted an extensive promotion campaign prior to the airing of the shows. Advertisements were placed on commercial radio and television networks. Direct mailings explaining RFD were sent to rural families; support was also solicited from organizations representing rural adults.

The RFD programs seem to have successfully reached a large portion of the potential viewing population. A viewer survey conducted during the fifteenth week of RFD broadcasts indicated that 23.3 percent of the respondents had seen an RFD program. Of these, 14.4 percent rated the programs excellent, 69.5 percent judged them good, 13.6 percent said fair, and no one rated them poor. The survey also determined that many urban residents as well as rural people were watching RFD programs, and that the viewing audience was older than the average TV viewing audience. There were significantly more female viewers than males.

In addition to the above results, one project staff member indicated that viewer surveys also showed "the proportion of undereducated adults who watched the programs was roughly equal to the percentage of undereducated adults in the total population." This finding can be interpreted in two different ways. A critic might argue that the shows were not sufficiently focused toward the target audience. On the other hand, undereducated adults seldom watch educational television, and thus, the percentage who did watch represented a higher percentage than might normally be expected. Television is very difficult to focus selectively, because anyone who owns a set can tune in. RFD's experience may have identified an important side benefit to using television as an educational medium--persons other than the intended audience can tune in and participate if the programs meet their needs.

Home Study Materials

In its original proposal, RFD indicated that the purpose of the home study materials was to "aid in the development of participant skills in the basic field of communication and computation," indicating a basic literacy approach. Yet, the materials actually developed and used were "coping skills" oriented (e.g., money management) and were written on the fifth grade level. Does this represent serious displacement of original goals? After all, how can a mediated system for "providing adult basic education courses for the rural disadvantaged" obtain these objectives by concentrating solely on coping skills? The answer, if there is an answer, may lie in the project's approach to the development of the RFD Home Study Materials.

The development process began with a search of already available ABE materials. It was determined that most of the existing ABE materials were not suited for RFD's purposes, since they were sequential in nature--a student who used them was necessarily committed from beginning to end. Confronted with this discovery, RFD decided to create its own materials. A needs survey was therefore administered to a sample of undereducated rural adults. The results indicated that those questioned were most interested in a coping skill focus. Regardless of the needs survey results, however, an issue remained. As a respondent in the Wisconsin state ABE department put it, "No matter how well a person copes, he still has to read."

All materials were written at the fifth grade level because the project did not have the resources to produce materials at all levels. Though perhaps necessary, this decision may have been unfortunate in that it effectively eliminated the least educated from participating in the project.

The content of the materials was developed by rewriting other literature such as extension bulletins and basic human relations publications. A staff member designed some of the content himself. The home study materials were packaged into five volumes termed "Content Centers": "About Me," "About Me and Others," "About Me and My Money," and "Me and My Community."

Each RFD participant was sent an order card from which he could select whatever items he desired. He could start anywhere in the series. The reading matter was periodically alluded to in the television series, though there was no attempt at a hard sell. In its external evaluation, Colorado State University questioned whether the television series effectively motivated the use of materials. Nevertheless, there was a great demand for them, so great that supplies were quickly depleted. No priority system was instituted to insure that undereducated adults would receive materials first. Consequently, while some persons without real need received the publications, undereducated participants were often delayed in beginning the program for lack of them.

A publisher was sought for the home study materials, once they had been field-tested. Bids were solicited from a number of publishers; four indicated interest. The Steck Vaughn Company of Austin, Texas was ultimately selected. It is often claimed that publishers are reluctant to publish ABE materials because the market is "thin," but RFD had no difficulty securing a publisher. In the opinion of the RFD staff, publishers were enthusiastic about the readings because they were polished--well conceived, well put together, and physically attractive. RFD was able to produce literature of such polish in part because they were able to draw upon the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Wisconsin School of Journalism for the needed expertise.

RFD's experience has shown that there are both advantages and disadvantages to commercially publishing 309 (b)-developed materials. An advantage is that, in seeking a profit, a commercial publisher is motivated to market and disseminate materials long after the 309 project has terminated. On the other hand, commercial publishers will not generally publish reading matter unless it is protected by copyright. Because of USOE publishing regulations, RFD could not distribute free large quantities of its materials. Once they were published, copyright laws prohibited local ABE programs from reproducing them by Xerox or other copy processes.

Home Visitors

The Home Visitors were a central component of the RFD system, and in terms of cost per participant, the most expensive. Home Visitors were assigned to fifty RFD participants, a sample selected for the manageability of its size. Though it was originally thought that Home Visitors would serve in an instructional role, this idea was discarded early in the first grant year. As it turned out, Home Visitors served as confidants and friends. They were to act as a bridge between the RFD "content centers" and the participants, and were to help the participant with any problem he might have, educational or otherwise. In short, a Home Visitor was to be a personal, one-to-one representative of RFD. Her most important function was to stimulate and motivate use of the home study materials.

Criteria for selection of Home Visitors included experience in relating to rural undereducated adults, a warm personality, articulateness and tolerance. Eight Home Visitors were selected, and each had a case load of six or seven participants. All Home Visitors were women who were trained by the project and reported to a supervisor.

One project respondent quite familiar with Home Visitor activities said:

> The way I saw it, the Home Visitors were the only thing that made RFD work. These adults would not even have watched the program if it hadn't been for the Home Visitors--they are not the kind of people who would watch Channel 21. You have to have somebody who says it's important....TV by itself is not enough. TV had very little influence on our people; they watched it because we wanted them to.

One of the problems Home Visitors encountered was the scarcity of materials. They were often in the position of apologizing

for the project's failure to maintain an adequate publications inventory. Another problem was the short duration of the program - twenty weeks. Many Home Visitors found it difficult to establish rapport and accomplish their objectives in that period of time. Although it was a secondary objective, Home Visitors were instructed to bring basic literacy and computation skills materials to their participants if they requested them. Very few requests were registered.

At the end of the twenty-week home visitation period, an evaluation of the Home Visitor component was conducted. Home Visitor participants and a control group of similar participants who had viewed the TV programs, but had not received home visitation, were administered a test developed by the University of Wisconsin. This test measured verbal skills, numerical skills, and coping behavior. No significant difference was found between the performance of the treatment and control groups.

Action Line

The action line component was an attempt to provide a link between RFD's viewer-participants and the centers. When an RFD viewer experienced a problem and called the action line number, volunteer workers noted the problem. If the problem could be solved on the spot it was, but if it required referral it was channeled to the relevant agency. Action line calls were followed up to make sure the caller had actually received help from the referral agency. In total, action line received 1,641 calls, 85 percent of them either requests for RFD materials or simple enough for volunteers to answer directly.

The RFD Almanac

Like the action line, the RFD Almanac was an attempt to increase contact with participants and to motivate participation in RFD. The Almanac was a monthly tabloid newspaper containing practical information and RFD promotional literature. It was sent to anyone who expressed an interest in participating in RFD, to those who contacted action line, and to adults referred by county and local social services offices. In all, 3,300 persons received the Almanac.

The RFD Newsletter

The Newsletter was one of RFD's major external dissemination devices. It was sent to professional people--local ABE directors, state ABE directors, congressmen, and educational TV professionals. Over 2,700 names were included on the Newsletter's computerized mailing lists. Anyone who contacted RFD for information was automatically added to the mailing list. There were thirty-six issues of the Newsletter.

The Newsletter included descriptions of the RFD components, comments on the RFD design, both pro and con, and evaluative data gathered by the university.

Issues

A major issue raised by the operation of RFD is that of goal displacement. Originally, RFD was supposed to be a media-based ABE project stressing basic communication and computational skills. Yet, in actuality, the project generally ignored basic literacy while focusing on coping skills and their media presentation. Although it is an open question whether this change in focus was beneficial or detrimental, necessary or unnecessary, it is important to consider why the change in focus occurred. At issue here may be the question of whether the project should have been controlled by media specialists or professional adult educators.

The original RFD proposal resulted from a committee comprised of both media people from WHA-TV and adult educators from the University of Wisconsin. After the project was funded, however, authority for grant administration rested with WHA-TV. The project director reported to the WHA-TV station manager. Though his Bachelor's degree was in adult education, his advanced degree and working experience were in mass communications. In an interview he stated, "I prefer being situated in the Communication Center rather than the Education Center."

RFD staff maintained input from adult education professionals through an advisory committee comprised of professors from the University of Wisconsin Education Department, persons from University Extension and from the State ABE Department. RFD staff seemed to agree with several committee members that the advisory committee did not have a really significant input to the project after work began. An RFD central staff member stated, "We work closely with adult education specialists (i.e., the advisory committee), as well as with client groups. We usually find the latter right and the former wrong.... The professionals, however, are helpful politically."

RFD staff found the adult educators helpful in facilitating the formation of connections with other influential persons in adult education, but did not take the committee's professional advice very seriously. One member of the advisory committee, an official of the State Education Department, recounted an incident when the project staff asked the committee why RFD had not been supported to a greater degree by ABE personnel within the HEW region. Another committee member responded, "This staff with all its enthusiasm has never heard what this committee had to say." Another member of the advisory committee stated, "They (the project staff) should

have immersed themselves more in the cruddy work of low literacy and less in the polished work of television."

The foregoing data suggest goal displacement which may have resulted from giving the media aspects of the RFD project predominance over the educational aspects. On the other hand, television is a highly sophisticated medium requiring great production skill and experience for effective use. Had the adult education professionals been in control of the project, the quality of the basic delivery system may have been impaired. In most people's minds the purpose of the project was primarily to test the mediated delivery system.

Dissemination

Project RFD undertook an extensive external dissemination campaign aimed outside the WHA-TV viewing area. One respondent stated that, "They (RFD) did more dissemination than any other project I know of." RFD's dissemination vehicles included the already-mentioned RFD Newsletter, a series of workshops, publications in professional journals, site visits, presentations at national conventions, and a final report. Of these, the Newsletter and the workshops probably reached the greatest number of people. Workshops were held in all HEW regions. On the average, 800-900 people were invited to each workshop, though attendance averaged fifty persons. The low number of attenders may have been caused by RFD's policy of not reimbursing participants. Workshop participants were selected by inviting all those on the Newsletter mailing list plus others nominated by the Office of Education and various professional associations. One RFD staff member commented:

> In the second year we had the apparent problem of overdissemination. We got some negative feedback from people who thought we were engaged in a fantastic national program of publicity. Nothing was further from the truth. The negative feedback came from members of NUEA, AEA, and the Commission of Professors. The positive response was strong.

This staff member was primarily referring to dissemination carried out by the Newsletter. The Newsletter was very candid, reporting criticisms of the project as well as accolades. One issue, for example, reported the basic literacy versus coping skills controversy described earlier. So candid was the Newsletter that one respondent observed, "They talked too much about things they should have shut up about."

An important distinction to note is that, in their dissemination efforts, RFD concentrated on conveying general awareness information about the project rather than on securing replication of the

demonstration. RFD is not a project easily replicated on either the state or local level, since a television station as well as considerable funds would be needed. Moreover, though the RFD TV segments have all been videotaped in self-contained units, they include many specific references to the WHA-TV viewing area. Thus, if another program wished to use the TV sequences, these local references would have to be edited out and other locally prepared segments substituted.

It might be feasible for some local programs to adopt portions of the RFD system, an adaptation of the Almanac or other materials, for example. Yet, the project was designed to test an integrated ABE delivery system, and replication of the entire system is far beyond the means of most ABE programs. Use of RFD products has not gained currency even in Wisconsin. The Wisconsin state ABE agency has never used or recommended use of RFD materials. A state education official gave the following reasons: "There are no steps or procedures that an ABE program can follow to adopt RFD products. RFD products are too expensive; and there is doubt that RFD products would be suitable for the ABE target population."

Another issue related to dissemination was summed up by one respondent as follows:

> RFD has never been validated as a system. Only the Home Visitor component was evaluated, and it was evaluated separately. Is it worthy of dissemination? We don't know. Should we bother to disseminate an unproved product? But for validation you need vast amounts of money, and in adult education there is little RFD money, money for product development and testing. This is very unfortunate.

In the initial development of the RFD proposal, the Wisconsin state ABE director was involved. She also served on the advisory committee. There was, however, no conscious effort by RFD to include local ABE programs in the project in other than an advisory capacity. This lack of operational involvement with local ABE programs is perhaps explained by the fact that RFD was not designed for local ABE programs. The project director stated: "In our dissemination effort we aimed at the decision-makers rather than directly at the ABE directors. Our real purpose was to set up a national project; our real aim was to reach a mass audience." The project director then went on to explain that from the very beginning he had hoped RFD would "go national." Midway through the project an effort was made to form a consortium of midwestern states to replicate RFD on a regional basis. The consortium never came to fruition, as it did not gain enough support among the states. RFD never did go national, but a vocational education offshoot program, Project 360°, received a national commitment from the Educational Television

Network. Project 360° began airing its shows in January, 1973, in fourteen states. USOE funded a portion of 360°. The project director's avowed, implicit agenda for external dissemination was to reach those with the power and influence to make the adult educational TV concept a nationwide venture. In this regard, national adult education and media opinion leaders seem to have been the primary targets for dissemination, not local or even state ABE programs.

When the RFD project director was asked how he evaluated the dissemination effort,he responded, "it was very successful." The primary objective criterion for this judgment was the large number of requests RFD received for more information about the project. Another factor was the Educational TV Network's acceptance of 360° for funding and production.

Conclusion

RFD spent considerable time, money, and effort to disseminate, and it used sophisticated mass communications techniques to do so. To date, however, RFD has merely disseminated general awareness information about the project--mainly to key people in the media and educational establishments--and this effort alone has proved insufficient to secure replication of the mediated system. Except for the coping skills materials, which were published commercially, RFD never intended its outcomes to be utilized by local ABE programs. Consequently, it made no effort to reach local ABE programs. The company that published the materials, of course, will attempt to market them.

The basic policy issue raised by this case is whether some portion of 309 (b) funds should be earmarked for demonstrating alternative, comprehensive systems of adult education instruction. Such use of funds does not seem to be precluded by the enabling legislation. In the case of projects like RFD, dissemination to local ABE programs is largely irrelevant, since the objective is to demonstrate alternatives to current practice rather than to respond to the immediate needs of ongoing programs.

PROJECT COMMUNI-LINK: A SYSTEM FOR COMMUNITY-WIDE INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Project Communi-Link (PCL) operated from July, 1970 to June, 1973 at Colorado State University, which received total USOE funding of $820,000. The originator of the project was an adult education professor at the university who had had wide experience in community development work both in the U.S. and overseas. The other key staff member had a background in public school adult education, and by the third year had become co-director of the project.

Project Objectives

The initial proposal, developed by the project director in consultation with the USOE regional program officer in Denver, was targeted on the Division of Adult Education's 309 (b) priority for fiscal year 1970 of "demonstrating community-wide adult basic education programs." The purpose of the project was set forth in the first year proposal:

> This proposal has as its fundamental purpose the provision of training and consultative assistance to teams of rural community professionals, paraprofessionals, and volunteer workers who have responsibilities pertaining to the provision of basic educational opportunities for disadvantaged adults. The primary focus and thrust of the project encompass the development of more effective cooperative relationships among responsible professionals and others in selected rural communities....

The name Communi-Link captures the essence of the project, described in later promotional material as encouraging "the development and enhancement of communication linkages necessary for communities to identify problems, assess resources, and mobilize resources to meet local needs." The project's mission, consequently, was community development with an emphasis on adult education programming.

The Basic Process

PCL developed a systematic, structured process for aiding local communities to plan, implement, and evaluate coordinated, community-wide adult basic education programs--or other community improvement programs, depending on local interest. Following identification of pilot communities and interpretation of the PCL idea to their leaders, each community was asked to send six representatives to participate in a day-and-a-half workshop at Colorado State University. The workshop, which typically consisted of about seventy participants from ten to twelve communities, provided an introduction to PCL's objectives as well as training in community-wide program development through a simulation game called "Microville." According to a PCL document, it was anticipated that the workshop would result in each participant having

> increased awareness of the many and varied needs, wants and ideologies represented in a community; the many resources available in a community; the extent to which there are both gaps and duplications in local services; and the need for, as well as problems associated with, group problem solving.

A frequent and intended outcome of the Colorado State workshops was an invitation to PCL to conduct a similar workshop in the local community.

By autumn 1972, PCL had trained approximately 300 community representatives on campus and 4,500 additional persons in local community workshops. The intended result of all this activity was the establishment or revitalization of adult education or community improvement councils in the pilot communities. PCL's role did not end here, however. Recognizing that the local councils would need assistance in getting fully underway, PCL provided technical assistance. Each community was assigned a "community services coordinator" from PCL who acted as a liaison between Colorado State and the local council. This staff member provided or arranged needed technical assistance; for example, help in conducting a community survey to assess needs and available resources. PCL also organized local workshops to train ABE teachers and volunteer tutors.

Microville

The key element in PCL's training strategy was use of a simulation game called Microville. Two Columbia researchers participated in a full-scale Microville workshop conducted for University of Wyoming extension employees in December, 1972. The game used at this workshop, a slightly modified version of the original Microville, emphasized community improvement rather than adult education. The workshop began with an introduction to PCL and a synchronized tape-slide presentation of the project's activities in the pilot community of Price, Utah. Participants were assigned to fourteen Microville Community Improvement Councils, each consisting of six to eight members. Every council member was given a role to play: minister, businessman, school superintendent, recreation supervisor, adult education director, and so on. The "mayor" of Microville provided background on conditions in the community and informed the council of what it was supposed to accomplish.

The first cycle in the Microville game involved twenty minutes of get-acquainted activity. Next, the council was instructed by the mayor to outline a "philosophy" of community improvement based on group consensus. The third cycle required developing a plan for identifying Microville's needs and wants. This involved going to the gameboard for information. Each gameboard contained data cards with information on needs and wants, community resources, and socio-economic data. Cards were organized on the board by source of data, e.g., community agencies, business and industry, residential area. Additional data could be obtained by listening to the (recorded) Microville radio station or by consulting back issues of the (mimeographed) Microville newspaper. The number of data cards

allowed for each council was determined by throwing dice. The fourth cycle, following identification of needs and wants and assignment of program priorities, involved determining program objectives. Each council member was instructed to write one attainable and measurable "community-wide" objective. The fifth cycle was designated "implementation." The council was told to design, in writing, operational programs consistent with its previously formulated philosophy and statement of objectives. This required returning to the gameboard to get additional information on resources available for program implementation. The final cycle called for developing a plan to evaluate the "implemented" program. After the game, an effort was made to evoke discussion of the implications of Microville for extension work in Wyoming.

Participants interviewed by the researchers felt that the workshop had been a worthwhile or at least interesting experience, but they had difficulty articulating the implications of Microville for their work as extension agents. In the two groups in which the researchers participated, there was a good deal of confusion and frustration, due in part to inadequately explained rules and procedures, but even more to insufficient time to complete the various cycles.

Microville is clearly a complex, time-consuming simulation experience requiring considerable motivation on the part of the players. It also demands a highly skilled and experienced team to organize and monitor the process.

PCL conducted this workshop for university extension employees, few of whom had any connection with local ABE programs, raising the question of PCL's purposes and priorities. The project was funded to demonstrate a community-wide approach to ABE programming, yet ABE was not the exclusive and perhaps not even the primary focus of project activities. PCL did emphasize ABE in its literature and in the original Microville game, but some pilot communities were less interested in adult education than in other kinds of community activity. In these cases, PCL resources were used to support community development unrelated to ABE. Interviews with staff revealed tension between ABE and more general community development goals. Some staff members, particularly during the project's second year, advocated a narrower ABE emphasis, while others, including the director, favored a broad community development perspective. Speaking to this issue, the director observed: "I try to suggest that poverty problems are an important concern, and this is true of all communities--and this leads to an awareness of ABE." Awareness of ABE, however, did not always lead to action.

Overview of Project Operations

By the end of its first year, PCL was operating in eighteen

communities in nine Western states: Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. In its second year the project expanded to thirty-two communities in fourteen states, adding Washington, Oregon, Arizona, New Mexico, and Minnesota to the original nine.

It took the better part of the first grant year for PCL to establish its own linkages with project states and pilot communities. Contact was initiated with the state ABE director and the state director of cooperative extension. After interpreting the project to these officials and obtaining their cooperation, the next step involved selecting the pilot communities. PCL specified two criteria: population of 15,000 or less and the presence of some form of adult education program. Consideration was also given to the "readiness" of communities. PCL did not want to work solely with communities where success was assured. On the other hand, its staff did not wish to become involved in communities where the chances of cooperative efforts were nil. In the end it was decided that the state ABE and extension directors would select one community deemed fairly promising and another community where the chances of success were thought to be less favorable. In addition to selection of the pilot communities, state level negotiations resulted in identifying one or two "state instructional consultants" who were to act as liaisons between PCL and the local pilot communities. Mostly extension workers with wide community contacts, the instructional consultants were employed part-time, usually a day or less per week.

In its first year PCL was admittedly understaffed. The sole full-time professional was the assistant project director (later co-director). The director continued to devote time to teaching and other professional duties. There were three part-time "community services coordinators" in addition to the assistant director, and a part-time internal evaluator. However, by the fall of 1971, the staff had expanded to a size commensurate with a fourteen-state operation. The three part-time community services coordinators of the first year were replaced by seven full-time professionals, including two individuals with experience in ABE, two Mexican-Americans with community development experience, one man with expertise in conference planning, and another with a background in public relations and mass media. Several graduate assistants, a part-time community services coordinator, and one more secretary were added to the staff.

Organizational Context

No 309 exists in isolation from other agencies and organizations, some of which are important to the project's effective operation. PCL practiced its own principles by stressing communication and cooperation in its relations with individuals and

agencies in its environment. A close working relationship was established with the USOE regional program officer in Denver. This step facilitated cooperation from key people in state systems because of the RPO's influence and contacts. Likewise, state directors of extension and ABE were involved in planning and kept informed of project developments. It is likely that such involvement enhanced support for PCL at the state level. The project also established close and continuing working relationships with the thirty-two pilot communities.

Within Colorado State University the project was highly visible. The Dean and President were familiar with it and appeared supportive. This pattern of cooperation and communication at the institutional, community, state, and regional levels was not, however, characteristic of the project's relationship with USOE. PCL staff reported little meaningful communication with their OE project officer, other than one perfunctory site visit. The lack of close monitoring by Washington ("they let us go off on our own") was seen as an advantage, but uncertainty concerning the amount of continued support and late notification of contract renewal created problems after the project's first year.

Dissemination

PCL is of particular note because it was one of the few 309's to make a vigorous, organized effort to disseminate. It is of interest also because its "output" was essentially a process, indeed a very complex process. The problems of disseminating a complex process were clearly recognized by the PCL staff. It was evident to them, as it was to the researchers, that real dissemination of PCL would necessarily involve intensive training of state level professionals who could subsequently conduct Microville workshops for local communities and follow through with technical assistance. In other words, effective dissemination would necessitate replicating the project's capability to run Microville workshops and provide consultative assistance--something like reproducing a host of little Communi-Links in state capitols across the country.

Obviously, training others to administer Microville would have been an extremely costly strategy. Consequently, PCL proposed in its third year to conduct a dissemination program that would concentrate on eliciting awareness and interest. It was hoped that a fourth year of funding would allow for intensive Microville training in non-project states. But the short-run strategy was to spread the word, to stimulate interest. What was disseminated was not the capability to run Microville workshops, but rather information about Microville and PCL's activities.

Dissemination began in earnest near the end of the second year of funding. Thousands of pieces of literature, including a

periodic newsletter and attractive brochures about PCL's activities and Microville, were mailed to state ABE directors, adult education professors, state extension staff, legislators workshop participants, and others. Complete annual reports were sent to selected groups including the state ABE directors and adult education professors. A twenty-seven page descriptive booklet was widely distributed in the winter of 1972-73. In November, 1972, PCL presented an overview of its activities to a group of about one hundred adult educators at the Adult Education Association's annual convention.

The major dissemination activity following the convention consisted of a "diffusion workshop" campaign to provide information about PCL achievements to key adult educators and other relevant education and social service professionals in non-project states. The diffusion workshop idea was conceived by the project co-director (formerly assistant director), who headed a PCL "diffusion committee" that developed an overall diffusion strategy and a detailed plan for the special diffusion workshop. As originally envisioned, the one-day workshop would provide information on PCL's philosophy, activities, and achievements, and introduce participants to Microville by permitting them to play the needs assessment cycle of the game.

The first diffusion workshop was held in Little Rock, Arkansas, in December, 1972. In accordance with PCL's diffusion plan, the state ABE director organized and "hosted" the workshop, inviting participants and making local arrangements. Detailed instructions were provided by PCL in the form of a "Local Coordinator's Handbook." About seventy people were invited to the workshop, but only half that number showed up--and of these, fewer than a third were directly involved in ABE. Although attendance was disappointing, the workshop itself (attended by a Columbia researcher) went off smoothly and evoked considerable enthusiasm from the majority of participants. The primary problem was lack of time to do justice to the Microville needs assessment component. At the end of the day a very "aware and interested" group was given the following disappointing news: "The only tangible assistance that Project Communi-Link can give to Arkansas is to send you materials and information. If we get money next year, we can come and do Microville."

At the time of Little Rock, PCL had already received ten requests from non-project states for diffusion workshops; concerted efforts were also being made to interest other states. There was a faint hope among PCL staff that USOE would come through with a fourth year of funding if enough interest in PCL were aroused and this interest communicated to USOE. By mid-spring 1973, eleven diffusion workshops had been held in non-project states, and PCL had plans for twenty-five more before expiration of funding on June 30th. If all went according to plan, PCL hoped to reach 4,000

people through its diffusion workshops.

There is an interesting footnote to the story of PCL's dissemination campaign. According to key project staff, PCL's campaign was initially opposed by several DAEP staff members who argued that dissemination was their responsibility, not the project's. Although dissemination to non-project states was written into the third year proposal, availability of funds for this purpose was in doubt until the very last moment.

Conclusion

PCL was one of the largest and most visible of the 309's funded in the early seventies. In many ways it was a model demonstration project, well organized, staffed by competent, enthusiastic people, and, according to evaluation reports, relatively successful in achieving its stated objectives. But now that the project has terminated, one wonders to what extent its impact will be felt outside of the original pilot communities.

Some reasons for this skepticism are outlined below:

1. Communi-Link's approach to improving local ABE programs was highly indirect. It was never expected that local ABE program directors would organize Microville workshops in their communities. Instead, PCL hoped that state ABE and cooperative extension agencies would conduct workshops and provide technical assistance and that local ABE programs would be the beneficiaries of coordinated, community-wide program development.

2. Communi-Link's "output" was a complex process, difficult to explain and comprehend, non-divisible (one cannot replicate a portion of it), and costly in time and money. These are formidable obstacles to adoption.

3. The Communi-Link process is not only expensive for state agencies to replicate, but it would have been extremely costly for PCL to disseminate. Complete dissemination, that is dissemination to enable utilization, would have required extensive training, particularly in the use of Microville. PCL did not have the money to do this training. Instead, the project concentrated, through its diffusion workshops, on eliciting interest and awareness in the hope that additional funding would permit training of state personnel. Additional funding did not materialize, and as a consequence PCL was unable to follow through with the final stage of its dissemination strategy.

Although PCL did not provide training to non-project states, it did widely disseminate information about its activities, and undoubtedly some project ideas and techniques were picked up and

used by local ABE programs. In addition, the project produced and distributed various materials, such as a handbook on how to conduct a community survey. PCL hoped that state agencies in each of the pilot states would perpetuate its work with local communities. This was a major objective of SCAN (State Community Assistance Network), a series of meetings and workshops involving various state level agencies organized by PCL in its final year.

The major lesson to be drawn from PCL's experience is that complex process innovations are extremely difficult to disseminate if utilization, not simply awareness, is the ultimate goal. Time-consuming and costly training is essential. This means that much more money, time, and careful planning need to go into project dissemination components. Unless these realities are understood by government decision-makers, the full potential of projects like Communi-Link for improving educational practice is bound to be unrealized.

SWCEL: R & D PRODUCTS FOR THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN COMMUNITY

The Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory (SWCEL) ABE project received a total of $1,635,735 from USOE, making it the second largest* 309 (b) project in the history of the program. SWCEL was also awarded a $133,000 309 (c) teacher training grant in 1969, bringing total OE funding to more than $1.75 million. The project commenced operations in fiscal year 1967, when the national 309 program first began, and was terminated four years later. The project grantee was one of a network of OE-sponsored regional R & D laboratories. Located in Albuquerque, New Mexico, SWCEL's major goal was the improvement of educational opportunities for Mexican-Americans.

Project Objectives

The initial project objective was the development of a series of TV units, called Empleen Ingles, designed to teach conversational English to Spanish-speaking adults. Although Empleen Ingles continued to be an important project component, SWCEL vastly increased the scope of its activities after the first year. The following quotation from the third year proposal gives some picture of the larger operation:

> (SWCEL) proposes to continue to act as systems manager and to develop and produce components for a prototype

---

*Washington, D.C.'s Adult Education Demonstration Center received slightly more money.

> instructional package that will attack problems common to the illiterate Spanish-surnamed adult. The critical mass of manpower, facilities, and materials has been assembled to produce a package containing color TV films, student workbooks, teacher guides, programs for aides, teacher training protocols, and guidelines for establishing intereducational agency collaboration ....The instructional content of the package has included linguistic materials necessary for the illiterate adult in his attempt to negotiate the major culture to accomplish the usual life tasks of taking care of a family, finding a job, etc. The programs are designed for maximum effectiveness and a dissemination plan is being developed concurrently which concentrates on developing a package delivery strategy that provides the most advantageous mass impact.

The terms "systems manager" and "instructional package" in the above description are telling. Various components of a rather loosely conceived "system" to upgrade ABE for Mexican-Americans were planned and managed from Albuquerque. Some components were developed and produced by the Lab itself, others were contracted out to universities and educational R & D organizations. Some were designed for use by ABE students, others for training teachers. Despite the rhetoric of "systems" and "components," SWCEL did not appear to have a carefully developed plan or focus for its activities. This impression was borne out in interviews with key staff. The Project director described his own conception of SWCEL as "very broad," claiming that at one time "Washington looked at us as a project to serve all Mexican-Americans." He noted, however, that the project's ambitions "suffered a major setback" when OE unexpectedly turned down a proposal to train teachers of Chicano adults in the Midwest. The director emphasized that the project was concerned with all Chicano education--for children as well as adults.

Other staff stressed the teacher training component of the project as constituting its major thrust. Such was the view of a senior research associate who was the other key staff member along with the director. But this individual also noted that SWCEL was "very flexible" and undertook many activities in response to needs as they were identified. She cited as an example the Human Resource Center Directory, a national listing of people with expertise in areas of concern to Mexican-Americans.

The ABE project's mandate appeared to be quite broad. Financial support was provided by Washington for worthwhile activities to improve ABE for Mexican-American adults. Staff had considerable leeway in deciding what particular activities were worthwhile. This is not to say that there were no checks on the Lab's initiative but,

as one staff member pointed out, the project enjoyed considerable autonomy, and lack of money was not a significant problem.

Project Operations

The ABE project, though housed and administered by the Lab, enjoyed semi-autonomous status because of its separate funding. It had its own mission, budget, and personnel, although it sometimes borrowed staff from the Lab's production department. From the point of view of the ABE staff the situation was ideal. The project was able to draw on the resources of the Lab, including its impressive technical production capabilities, and yet remained insulated from many of the problems and conflicts that plagued the parent organization. In its heyday in 1969, with funding at $800,000, the ABE project was a major part of the total SWCEL operation, accounting for an estimated 25 to 35 percent of the Lab's operating budget. A staff of twelve full-time employees included a community liaison man, a project coordinator (a kind of staff supervisor), a supervisor of field testing, four secretaries, and several professionals working on various project components. Turnover among the professional staff was high, but continuity of leadership was provided by the senior research associate mentioned earlier, a Cuban educator with considerable experience as a teacher and teacher trainer. Originally hired to develop an English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher training package, she energetically set about expanding the project's teacher training activities. According to the director and other staff, and by her own account, this employee had a major impact on SWCEL's ABE activities from her arrival in the second year to the termination of the grant in the spring of 1971.

Like many other large 309 projects, SWCEL had an advisory board. Organized by the project director, the board consisted of ABE directors, adult education professors, and representatives of the Mexican-American community from the Southwest and other states, such as California and Texas, with large concentrations of Mexican-Americans. One of the board's functions was to promote awareness of SWCEL's activities among adult educators in the Southwest and contiguous states. Significantly, SWCEL's relationships with the professional ABE community were reported as least satisfactory at the state level in New Mexico and at the local level in the city of Albuquerque. Staff also felt that relations with Washington were generally unsatisfactory due to turnover of project officers and what was seen as a communications gap between USOE project officers and their Washington superiors. One respondent complained that the termination of the grant was announced on short notice. When SWCEL's OE Program Officer was asked why he had not given word of the termination date, he replied that he did not have advance knowledge of the termination decision.

SWCEL also maintained institutional ties with a number of

subcontracting organizations, the most important being the University of Arizona, which produced the Empleen Ingles TV units, and the McMinnville, Oregon public school system, which, in addition to the SWCEL subcontract, had its own 309 (b) grant to develop a programmed learning center for "Spanish-surnamed Americans." The McMinnville project produced the ABE Readiness Materials, a series of instructional packages for Mexican-American ABE students.

Project Output

SWCEL was not only one of the largest and longest-lived 309's, but also one of the most prolific. SWCEL's products can be classified into three broad categories: 1) instructional packages for Spanish speaking adults; 2) teacher training materials; 3) miscellaneous products and services. Output in each of these categories is described below.

1. Instructional Materials. The most costly and glamorous instructional package was Empleen Ingles, a series of thirty half-hour video units designed to teach English to Spanish-speaking adults with little or no English proficiency. Featuring comic animated characters and a pretty Spanish-speaking teacher, each unit was designed as a self-contained lesson with specified behavioral objectives. Each contained a workbook for students and a teacher's guide. Empleen Ingles was produced in sound and color for either TV broadcasting or use with a 16 mm projector. Field test reports indicated that Empleen Ingles was quite successful in boosting English proficiency, particularly when the video units were supplemented by paper and pencil materials. The film could be either purchased or rented for $50 for a two-week period.* Also intended for instruction of Spanish-speaking adults were the ABE Readiness Materials, consisting of three modules or packages: the English Readiness Package, intended for adults with little or no English proficiency; the Comparative Buying Package (consumer education); and the How to Get a Job Package. Each package came with supplementary tapes, slides, and thirty manuals. Cost per package was roughly $200, with additional manuals available at $1.25 each.

2. Teacher Training Materials. The first teacher training product was the English as a Second Language Package designed to train ABE teachers in the audio-lingual approach to ESL instruction. Intended outcomes were stated in behavioral terms and could be assessed using a test included in the package. Also included were a fifteen-minute color film demonstrating the audio-lingual approach

---

* Prices, as of 1972, are provided to give the reader a sense of the investment required by potential adopters.

and a teacher's workbook. Like the other training materials, this package was intended for teacher trainers, not for self-instruction by teachers themselves. The package took about two hours to present and cost $264. Another training package, Performance Objectives, provided instruction in the use of behavioral objectives in classroom teaching. This package treated the subject in a general way and was applicable for teacher training at any educational level. The Performance Objectives Package contained a tape-slide presentation and teacher's workbook. It took four hours to present and cost $139. A companion package, Systems Approach to Lesson Planning, "provides teachers with training on techniques for converting written objectives into lesson plans" through use of a "systems matrix" in which the teacher records both planned and actual entry conditions, teaching procedures, and learner outcomes to facilitate corrective measures if achieved outcomes differ from those planned. This package took about four hours to present and cost approximately $195. A Teacher-Teacher Aide Companion Package was designed to provide simultaneous training in the "respective roles" of the teacher and the aide. Developed near the end of the project's funding period, it was never mass produced and marketed. A film on microteaching was also developed but never marketed. A Cultural Awareness Package was produced under subcontract to the Texas Guidance and Counseling Project, which adapted the package for its Teacher Awareness Kit.

3. Miscellaneous Materials and Services. Included in this category were all project outputs not designed for student instruction or teacher training. An early effort was the SWCEL Clearinghouse on Mexican-American Adult Basic Education. A computer-based information retrieval system similar to ERIC, the Clearinghouse, began operation as a general information system, but later shifted emphasis to instructional materials. SWCEL also produced a Here's How Recruitment and Motivation Kit, which was never mass produced. A Human Resource Center Directory was compiled listing persons across the country with expertise related to the problems of Mexican-Americans. A Materials Library Evaluation project resulted in published evaluations of reading, English, math, ESL, and other ABE materials. In addition to ratings of materials on eighteen dimensions, information on source, cost, and instructional level was provided. In its last months of operation, SWCEL published an Oral Placement Test for Adults, a diagnostic instrument designed to test ability to understand and speak English.

Dissemination

Not all of the output described above was or could be disseminated. Some materials never reached the production state, and services such as the Clearinghouse were never intended for replication. However, a number of tangible products were produced for dissemination including Empleen Ingles, the three teacher training

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

packages (ESL Training, Performance Objectives, Systems Lesson Planning), the ABE Readiness Materials (English Readiness, Comparative Buying, How to Get a Job), the Materials Library Evaluation, the Oral Placement Test, and the Human Resources Center Directory.

The intended users varied considerably, depending on the nature of the product. Empleen Ingles and the Readiness Materials were designed for instructional use in local ABE programs (Empleen Ingles could also be broadcast over educational TV). The teacher training materials, on the other hand, were intended for use by teacher trainers, who could be state ABE staff, university professors, or in-service education specialists in school systems or other agencies. These materials were not exclusively designed for ABE teacher training and therefore had potential appeal to a vast group of professionals involved in teacher preparation and in-service education. Most of the miscellaneous materials were intended for use by ABE programs. The Oral Placement Test, for example, could be employed to screen students for proper class placement. The Materials Library Evaluation could be helpful in selecting materials for local ABE programs. SWCEL's output, consequently, consisted of multiple, diverse products intended for a variety of potential users.

Several strategies were adopted to promote dissemination of SWCEL products: training workshops, mostly for those interested in the teacher training packages; "show and tell" sessions which reviewed materials, displayed products, and included a sample showing of Empleen Ingles; traveling displays, often at conferences, sometimes featuring a "mini workshop"; Adelante, a newsletter with a circulation of about 1,000; direct mail advertising utilizing individual brochures for each of the major packages; and individual responses to letters of inquiry which sometimes resulted in an invitation to put on a workshop or show and tell session. About 200 teacher training workshops were reportedly conducted by SWCEL staff over a three-year period. It was Lab policy to strongly recommend, and in some cases require, training in the use of packages. This increased costs considerably, but was thought necessary in the case of trainers with mixed qualifications or experience. After the project was terminated, training could no longer be provided and was therefore dropped as a condition of sale. Sale without adequate training was felt to be preferable to no sale at all.

Although dissemination through training workshops following the project's first year was a continuous process, other techniques such as the show and tell sessions and traveling displays were utilized mainly in the final six months of the project, when the staff decided to mount an aggressive dissemination program. Incorporated into this final effort were eleven two-day general dissemination workshops emphasizing the ABE Readiness Materials, Oral Placement Test, Empleen Ingles, the Recruitment and Motivation

Kit, and the ESL and Performance Objective packages. These sessions failed to reach large numbers of potential users. One workshop, for example, was attended by eleven persons, mostly from New Mexico, the other by six people, three from one agency in Texas. Show and tell demonstrations were provided for the Arizona State Education Department, the Albuquerque and Phoenix Job Corps centers, the Arkansas Valley Cooperative Association in La Junta, Colorado, and for groups visiting SWCEL headquarters. Among traveling displays were two appearances at Office of Education buildings in Washington.

SWCEL's fourth-year report included assessments of the effectiveness of these dissemination strategies. The eleven workshops, where actual training was provided, were reported to be particularly effective, primarily because satisfied workshop participants spread the word back home, resulting in inquiries from sources that otherwise would not have been aware of SWCEL. The show and tell sessions were judged somewhat less effective; nevertheless, observers found that "interest is generated which sometimes leads to either a workshop or a sale of materials." Much less interest appeared to be generated by traveling displays. It was noted that personal follow-ups of inquiries proved helpful in creating demand for workshops or show and tell sessions, but that few potential users were reached in this way.

As project staff emphasized, USOE did not encourage them to make any effort at dissemination. The project director recalled how OE staff had made it clear that SWCEL was considered merely the developer--it was not SWCEL's job to circulate material. Apparently, whatever dissemination took place resulted from the concern and initiative of project staff.

In addition to direct dissemination attempts, SWCEL tried to interest commercial publishers in marketing the materials. This effort was unsuccessful, however, reportedly because of the "thin market" nature of the products and restrictive OE copyright regulations. Moreover, SWCEL's materials were designed in a form that was very costly for a publisher to produce profitably. Had SWCEL consulted a publisher prior to development, the items might have been produced in a more commercially feasible format. Another OE regulation that created problems was one prohibiting production with project funds of more than 250 copies of any single publication. This regulation hampered efforts to disseminate the Human Resource Center Directory, since the original stock was quickly depleted. Both the Center Directory and the Materials Library Evaluation were turned over to the U.S. Government Printing Office for distribution, but were never printed, apparently because of lack of funds.

Efforts to produce and disseminate material, as the above discussion suggests, met with mixed success. Publications such

as the Human Resource Center Directory and the Materials Library Evaluation were distributed in small quantities and then sent to the Government Printing Office to gather dust. Some of the teacher training materials developed in the final year were never mass produced and marketed, most notably the Teacher-Teacher Aide Package and the film on microteaching. Most of the remaining products, including the Empleen Ingles series, the ABE Readiness Materials, and the Performance Objectives, ESL, and Systems Lesson Planning packages were turned out in limited quantities for distribution by the Lab. Empleen Ingles, which took four years of work plus a small fortune to develop, was never used after the final field test. Tapes suitable for TV broadcasting and reels of 16 mm film sat undistributed in SWCEL's storeroom. It was thought that the film version would be attractive to local ABE programs, since rental was a modest $50, but there were no takers. The other materials fared somewhat better, but not much.

A list of purchasers of ABE materials for the period January, 1971 to January, 1972 was obtained from the Lab. It was not possible to determine from the list which purchasers were definitely ABE programs and which were not, although the majority appeared not to be local ABE or ABE-related programs. Table 1 summarizes sales data for each product, indicating the number of purchasers and their geographical distribution.

Table 1
Sales Data for SWCEL ABE Materials for the Period Jan. 1971-Jan. 1972

Product	Number Sold	Geographical Distribution
ABE Readiness Materials:		
English Readiness	6	Southwest (3), Midwest (3)
Comparative Buying	3	Southwest (2), Midwest (1)
How to Get a Job	3	Southwest (1), Midwest (2)
Teacher Training Materials:		
Systems Lesson Planning	6	Southwest (6)
ESL Package	9	Southwest (8), Northeast (1)
Performance Objectives	43	Southwest (28), Northeast (7) Midwest (3), Northwest (4), South (1)

In all, seventy packages were sold to sixty different organizations in nineteen states. More than two-thirds of all sales were made in the Southwest. The Readiness Materials, intended for Spanish-speaking ABE students, sold at the rate of about one package

per month. In contrast, the Performance Objective Package and the other training materials, which were not specifically designed for ABE, sold at the rate of one package per week. Except for Performance Objectives, SWCEL's success in marketing these materials appears to have been modest.

Conclusion

SWCEL came up with a number of carefully developed and tested products of high technical quality, but utilization of these products by local ABE programs (or by state level trainers and consultants) seems to have been modest in relationship to the development investment. Some of the major factors which appear to have hampered effective dissemination and use of SWCEL output are discussed below.

1. The project suffered from a lack of focus and systematic development. There seemed to be little rationale for output of certain products and not others. Moreover, it was never clear just who the project was supposed to be serving. Goal displacement seemed to occur as the project placed increasing emphasis on the development of teacher training materials not designed expressly for the needs of Mexican-American ABE programs.

2. It is implied above that the teacher training materials had little appeal for many local ABE programs. One factor reducing their desirability was cost, not only the price of the packages themselves but the cost of training. Two of the packages were not explicitly designed for ABE teacher training, perhaps reducing their interest.

3. Cost and complexity probably retarded adoption of the instructional packages as well. These factors were especially salient in the case of Empleen Ingles, originally conceived as a series of thirty half-hour TV programs--ideally to be supplemented with paper and pencil materials and even tutorial assistance. But, as in the case of RFD, no takers could be found to plan and implement such an expensive and ambitious TV series. There were obstacles to adoption of the 16 mm film version, too. Essentially, the film series constituted an alternative instructional system for beginning level ESL classes. SWCEL, however, failed to provide evaluative information about the advantages of Empleen Ingles over more conventional approaches to basic English literacy. Consequently, ABE directors had little incentive to adopt the film series because the advantages of doing so were not clear.

4. As the above discussion indicates, much of SWCEL's output did not meet the felt needs of local ABE programs, although the material may very well have met other important needs. It appears that there was little involvement of local ABE people for the purpose of identifying priority areas of the field to which SWCEL could

respond with its substantial development capability.

5. Much of SWCEL's output was developed late in the grant period and was never mass produced, militating against its effective impact on ABE. Many of the products that were never mass produced were the most relevant to local ABE programs, notably the Materials Library Evaluation, the Oral Placement Test, and the Here's How Recruitment and Motivation Kit. SWCEL, of course, fulfilled its contract obligation by designing prototype materials. Unfortunately, termination of SWCEL's grant precluded the production and dissemination of these materials.

6. SWCEL failed to develop close linkages with state and local ABE agencies. Since SWCEL was not "plugged into" any ABE teacher training network (such as now exists in the Southwest) where Lab-trained teachers could in turn train others, the marketing and training operation never achieved the desired "snow-ball" effect. Dissemination effectively ended concurrently with the project itself.

7. To its credit, SWCEL made some effort, on its own initiative, to disseminate what had been produced. But this attempt clearly amounted to "too little, too late." Only the last six months of the grant period were available for intensive dissemination, and even at this point not all the materials were ready for distribution.

In hindsight, the project director believed that more effort should have been made to work through the state ABE agencies. He noted that materials could have been demonstrated to state ABE staff and more money pumped into materials production to enable free distribution of the packages to the state ABE directors. But SWCEL's linkages with the state ABE systems were weak or non-existent, and for this reason, as much as for any other, project impact on local ABE programs was less than it might have been.

TEXAS GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING: AN APPROACH TO IMPROVING ABE COUNSELING

The Texas Guidance and Counseling Project was funded for three years, beginning in 1968-1969, for a total of $427,000. The project was based at the University of Texas Extension Teaching and Field Service Bureau at Austin, and was headed by an experienced educator who was later to become dean of the Division of Extension. Other key staff included a project administrator and a communications specialist who joined the project in its second year as assistant director.

The initial impetus for establishing Texas Guidance and Counseling came from the director of USOE's Division of Adult Education, who reportedly asked a group of adult educators in his office what they would do with $95,000 if he were to make the funds

available. According to the future project director's recollections:

> Nobody wanted to touch it, but I said I would develop a package that would help ABE teachers to become more aware of their students' problems and cultural differences .... Later we wrote the proposal. As it turned out, we gave them something better than they thought they would get.

Delays in the disbursement of grant funds to Texas Guidance stalled initial project operations. Staffing the project, getting it off the ground, and producing "something concrete to show for the money" in the remaining months made the first year a hectic race against time. The need to produce results in a short time necessitated the subcontracting of materials development to the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The objective of the Texas Guidance and Counseling project was to improve ABE counseling in USOE Region VI*, utilizing multi-media training packages developed by the project. The First Year Report states:

> Two pilot centers in each of the five states will be used to arrive at one or several optimum programs of operation for ABE centers; an instructional package to orient professional counselors to Adult Basic Education will be developed; and the greatest dissemination possible will be sought for the information and attitudes contained within the Teacher Awareness Master Unit.

The Second Year Report further elaborates the objectives:

> To implement, in two pilot centers in each state, an experimental guidance and counseling program for Adult Basic Education...
>
> To provide extensive in-service training for counselors and teachers in each of the pilot centers...
>
> To encourage and assist the state ABE departments in promoting and implementing local guidance and counseling in-service programs for teachers and counselors...
>
> To conduct an in-depth, three-week professional counselor-training institute for ABE counselors in Region VI...

---

* States of Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arkansas

To publish the results of the ... Guidance and Counseling Project and provide liaison with other USOE Regions in an attempt to encourage national efforts in guidance and counseling for undereducated adults.

The Package

The project staff originally intended to develop a package for the in-service training of professional ABE counselors. A survey indicated, however, that the number of professional ABE counselors in the five-state region was extremely small, and that ABE teachers with little formal training or relevant counseling experience were doing the counseling. The staff therefore decided to gear its package toward training ABE teachers in the basics of counseling. As the instructions for the use of the kit stated,

> Problem: We currently do not have enough ABE counselors and may not have enough for quite a while.
>
> Solution: Acquaint teachers with basic principles so they can better counsel and guide their students when necessary.

As mentioned previously, the first package, called the Teacher Awareness Kit (TAK), was developed under subcontract by the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory. Consisting of audio tapes, overhead transparencies, a 16 mm film, 35 mm slides, articles, and papers, it covered a wide array of subjects from "Awareness of Human Needs" to "Methods of Placing the ABE Student." Originally priced at $250, the package took two-and-a-half days to present (without discussion it could probably be presented in one day, but discussion was held to be the most important component of the training program).

By the second year of the project more ABE counselors had been hired in the region. Most, however, had little experience in working with undereducated adults, and there was a need for a training program to help them cope with the problems of ABE. During that year the TAK was revised, and a second kit, Counselor Orientation Package (COP), was developed.

In the revised version of the TAK the hand-assembled diazo transparencies were replaced by lower quality but less expensive machine-made ones, and the bulky reel-to-reel tapes were transformed into cassettes. In addition, a film featuring popular singer Buffy St. Marie was replaced by the film, "A Harlem Family." Perhaps the most significant change, however, was the transformation of the lessons, originally loose materials grouped into content areas, into cardboard-wrapped, self-enclosed units sturdy enough to be mailed

separately. Improvements incorporating accumulated experience and feedback were made in content as well as format. The second unit, the Counselor Orientation Package (COP), was organized along a similar format. These changes, resulting in more compact packages, made possible a price reduction to $125 each, half the original price. The third year saw the development of a counselor training film, Belton, Jerold F., and the final revision of the kits.

The divisibility and modifiability of the packages proved important assets: individual units could therefore be used separately and adapted to suit the needs of the user. Cultural diversity within Region VI, which includes Texas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, is great. The target population varies not only along racial and urban-rural lines, but along the dimension of political ideology as well. Thus, part of the packages specifically addressed to the needs of Mexican-Americans in Texas proved inappropriate to the needs of New Mexico, with a large Indian population, and of Louisiana, where many of the poor are French-speaking. It was possible, however, for any participating state to modify the units.

The packages were developed with the help of adult education professors from the five state universities in Region VI, ABE practicioners, and members of state ABE departments. Feedback from the pilot communities was also incorporated into revision of the kits. Final decisions, however, were made by the central project staff.

The project staff made an effort to involve the Regional Program Officer and the five state directors in the development of the kits. This collaboration appeared to greatly facilitate training and dissemination.

Dissemination

The Texas Guidance staff launched a systematic campaign in an attempt to expose the packages to as many ABE personnel as possible. While there were some methodical attempts to disseminate nationally, the emphasis was on dissemination within Region VI.

Teacher training, the primary regional dissemination strategy, consisted of training "teacher trainers" at three-week summer institutes held in Austin. Graduates of the summer institutes, that is, certified trainers, subsequently used the packages developed by project staff to conduct in-service workshops in each of the five states in Region VI. A "total guidance/counseling program" was also established in two pilot centers in each state "to determine the most effective means of developing such an overall program in a local center."

The training strategy followed the "snowball" principle, or the "each-one-teach-one" method. As the project's Phase III report states:

> Regional three-week summer institutes (1969-1970) were conducted (in Austin) for Trainers of Teachers/Counselors/Administrators. The format of the institute was built around the concept that the participants were to become trainers within their respective states. With this concept in mind, the materials and methods used in the institutes were presented in such a manner so that the participants would become competent in presenting the package in local districts throughout their states.

The workshop "graduates" went home as "certified" trainers, and proceeded to train teachers and counselors in their states. By the end of the first summer 4000 teachers had been trained. The trainers were paid on a consultantship basis by the host programs, which were reimbursed by the Texas Guidance and Counseling project. Since the Texas Guidance workshops partially fulfilled state in-service training requirements, and since the teachers were given a small stipend for attending sessions, motivating teachers to participate was no problem. Thus the Texas Guidance and Counseling packages became a standard part of ABE staff development in Region VI. According to the project director,

> By giving a few people intensive training for three weeks and then sending them out, we made more progress in one year than we would have by training teachers in five years.

As the staff members emphasized time and again in interviews with the researchers, the primary function of the TAK and the COP as well as the Belton film, was to provoke thought and discussion. In their view the kits did not contain any answers; they were merely intended to alert practitioners to some of the problems inherent in counseling and teaching adults from different cultures. Thus, the important thing was not the presentation of as many of the units as possible in the course of a given workshop, but the group interaction that followed the presentations.

Most of Texas Guidance's national dissemination was conducted during the third year of the project. Between December, 1970 and April, 1971, teams trained by Texas Guidance conducted workshops in every HEW region except IX and X, which chose not to participate. A total of 312 participants attended the workshops, including sixty ABE teachers, sixty-three ABE counselors, eighty-nine ABE administrators, forty-four state ABE personnel, twenty university-affiliated people, and thirty-six "others." The participants were selected by the respective state ABE directors. On the whole, the workshops were favorably evaluated by the participants.

The Final Report states:

During the three years of the Project, the training of teachers, counselors, and administrators within Region VI has been based on the "training network" or "building block" approach. Under this plan, the Central Project Staff trained a core of teachers and counselors from each of the five states. These persons then became trainers within their own states, presenting the materials to other teachers and counselors who then became trainers for local workshops and conferences throughout the state.

This same approach was employed for the national training workshops conducted by the Project in other USOE regions. Persons selected by state directors to attend the regional workshops now constitute a cadre of trainers at the national level. In the coming months, these people will conduct workshops within their respective states in accordance with individual state plans. Thus, the influence of the Project and use of the materials developed will be continued.

Texas Guidance and Counseling also distributed directly the packages outside the region. Two copies of each kit were given to every state free of charge. In addition, the project sold $10-15,000 worth of packages, about half of them sold outside the region. The Southern Regional Education Board bought ten copies of each kit for a total (discounted) price of $5,000. The project director believed that selling the kits was superior to giving them away, since "if you give it away, people don't think it's any good." Today there are one or two kits in each state, and the University of Texas project staff believe that they do circulate. The kits are comprised of self-contained units which can be circulated separately, a feature that can facilitate increased exposure.

Impact

That the Texas Guidance and Counseling project had a major impact on ABE counseling in Region VI is undeniable. Outside the region its influence was much weaker. One tangible measure of successful dissemination is the number of packages distributed and the number of ABE teachers, counselors, and administrators exposed to the kits in workshops. In Region VI about 4,000 teachers and counselors, or about two-thirds of the total in the region, were trained using the Texas Guidance materials. In Louisiana, 90 percent of the ABE teachers and counselors were reportedly trained with these materials; in Texas the figure was 70-75 percent and in Arkansas 75-80 percent. Every state in Region VI received five copies of each of the packages, with additional packages available for purchase. Texas produced seventy-five copies of the TAK for distribution within the state. No comparable figures exist for the nation as a whole, but our own survey of ABE directors indicated

that 8.7 percent of local ABE directors used products or ideas from Texas Guidance and Counseling, and that nationwide 48.5 percent had at least heard of it.

An important question is whether exposure to the Texas Guidance and Counseling materials effected change in those trained. The explicit objectives of the training were to deepen teachers' and counselors' awareness of the impact of cultural differences on learning, to increase teachers' involvement with and feeling of responsibility for students, and, as a result, to improve ABE teaching. No rigorous evaluation has been conducted, but both project staff and the ABE practitioners interviewed expressed little doubt that these objectives were indeed accomplished. In one of the pilot communities, ABE personnel reported through interviews that teachers' increased awareness of students' motives and problems caused them to become more involved with the student as a complete person and to feel a greater individual responsibility for his retention and progress.

The staff of Texas Guidance were aware of the short duration of most attitudinal change, of its tendency to evaporate once the supportive "temporary system" (e.g., workshop, therapy session) is disbanded, and the participant goes back to his unchanged real-life situation. As one staff member pointed out to the researchers:

> We tried to keep the Texas Guidance and Counseling workshops from turning into sensitivity training. I am very much opposed to the fad of T-groups, because you turn people on artificially; and once they get home, how much of the effect lasts? By contrast, the impact we created was permanent--I hope.

The Texas Guidance and Counseling staff felt that lasting change was made possible partly by the great amount of concrete detail in the contents of the packages, so that

> as a specific case arises, the teacher or counselor can recall the relevant part and fall back on it. There is enough specific content in the package to make it possible to recall on specific instances. It is not only general material.

More important, group discussion, and not the presentation of material, was emphasized as the crux of the training sessions. The ample opportunities for group discussion, which occasionally called for explicit role playing, were intended to reinforce the participants' identification with new role perceptions and to help them to internalize new attitudes. The emphasis on small group process placed a critical value on the choice of trainers to conduct the workshops. As one former state ABE director said:

> The packages were used as a vehicle to bring people together and to start discussing issues. ...What makes the package utilization effective is the person who is presenting it....
>
> The discussion is supremely important. In one workshop we presented too much of the package in too little time--I don't think it was very effective....
>
> (A project staff member added), we were extremely selective in picking training teams for workshops in other regions.

The impact of Texas Guidance and Counseling on ABE as a whole in Region VI was summarized by state ABE personnel in Texas as no less than "the professionalization of ABE counseling." At the start of the project there were few or no professional ABE counselors, and those who did counseling rarely had previous experience with undereducated adults. As a result of the Texas Guidance project, a standardized training program was made a regular part of the training of ABE counselors and teachers.

Factors in Dissemination

A major factor facilitating the dissemination and adoption of the Texas Guidance and Counseling packages, both inside and outside of Region VI, was their divisibility. As noted above, in their later versions the kits were composed of ten completely self-contained units that could be mailed and applied individually. A user was able to select only those units that met his particular needs. The Texas Guidance staff encouraged users to revise and adapt materials where suitable. Some users, including the state of New Mexico and the Southern Regional Education Board, have indeed undertaken such revisions. Indications are, however, that substantial revision requires considerable effort and resources. Even so, the divisibility of the packages, originally addressed in large measure to the problems of Mexican-Americans in the Southwest and specifically in Texas, has made them serviceable in widely different locations and with different target populations. As one staff member pointed out, "The human needs components can be shown anywhere, and the cultural parts are modifiable."

Another factor facilitating dissemination of Texas Guidance and Counseling materials was a well-established network of communication and cooperation among the state directors and among local directors, the state personnel, and the regional program officer in Region VI. While this cooperation existed when Texas Guidance and Counseling came into being, project development and dissemination further enhanced it. One of the local ABE directors in Texas, who was involved both in the development and in the "consuming" of innovations,

explained that cooperation with the established communication system in Region VI permitted the project to utilize person-to-person dissemination strategies:

> The project staff must familiarize others with their ideas in person. Take, for example, our Armchair Program (not to be confused with the Philadelphia Adult Armchair).... First came impersonal dissemination: We sent around brochures and tried to determine how many people responded. We found out that we got responses only from those places where we had personally made representations.
>
> (Researcher): Money alone is not the most important factor in dissemination. Sophistication in dissemination techniques is important.
>
> (Local Director): Word-of-mouth is still the best dissemination technique. We try to involve the state director and the RPO. That's how you develop the notion of a region.

Cooperation of state directors and RPO's was also instrumental in spreading the word beyond the region through informal channels of professional communication.

A further advantage ensuing from the close relationship between Texas Guidance and state and local ABE personnel was that these agencies supplied constant feedback from grass roots practitioners. This feedback helped keep the project firmly tied to the practical needs of the field, undoubtedly enhancing the packages' utility and hence their "disseminability." In the words of one local ABE director, "Practitioners are fed up with Ph.D.'s coming in from the university and giving them a lot of theory that has nothing to do with grass-root needs."

A factor inhibiting dissemination of the Texas Guidance and Counseling packages was their cost. Kits originally sold for $250, but mass production economy enabled reduction of the price to $125. While some copies of the kits were given away to state departments of education, the extent of their further utilization by local ABE programs depended on face-to-face explanation of the kits' use. A national "cadre of trainers" was indeed prepared by Texas Guidance and Counseling, but after the project's demise, no additional packages could be produced, and expert training was no longer available except on a consultantship basis.

Conclusion

It is undeniable that Texas Guidance and Counseling was one of the more successful 309 (b) projects funded by USOE. Within

Region VI Texas Guidance and Counseling managed to virtually transform the training of ABE counselors and teachers. Texas Guidance and Counseling's success can be partly attributed to the fact that its outcome was a "hard" product, and hence relatively easier to disseminate than a process. More important, the divisibility and flexibility of the product made it easily adaptable to local needs and resources.

However, a product's divisibility and flexibility alone cannot ensure its adoption. Potential users must be made aware of its availability, its relevance to their needs, and how it "fits" into their operations. To achieve this goal, a 309 (b) project must win incorporation into an on-going, viable communications network. By becoming a regular part of the staff development system in Region VI, as well as by utilizing the formal and informal network of communications among the state directors and the RPO in the region, Texas Guidance and Counseling was able to assure at least some continued use of its results. In view of the frequency with which 309 (b) results seem condemned to evaporate after the demise of the projects, the longevity of the Texas Guidance and Counseling kits is indeed a positive outcome.

This success was largely limited to Region VI. Outside the region utilization of the Texas Guidance and Counseling packages has been much less marked. The project was unable to link with existing networks of communication and training as it did in Region VI despite a dissemination campaign aimed at preparing a national "cadre of trainers" who were to carry on the work. The demise of the project, the withdrawal of its resources, and the discontinuance of its services, created termination of nearly all dissemination activities.

LOCAL IMPACT PROJECTS: A COMPARISON OF THREE CASES

Local impact demonstration projects operate within a limited local area and do not have a regional or national orientation. Table 2 illustrates USOE 's commitment to funding projects of this nature from 1967 to 1973 (See following page).

Local impacts have accounted for the majority of projects funded since 1968. Our initial inclination was to concentrate research on the typically larger, nationally-oriented 309's, since pilot field work indicated a much greater likelihood that the outcomes of nationally-oriented projects would be disseminated. Although this initial assumption was corroborated by our survey data, we believed that lessons might be learned from the experience of local impact projects. As a result, field studies were conducted of three such projects to discover if they had disseminated their results, and if not, why not. This study led to several conclusions that seem to have considerable import for 309 (b) dissemination.

It should be noted, however, that with only three cases we cannot generalize to the total population of local impact projects. It is quite possible, for example, that the Model Cities' local impacts may differ in some ways from those analyzed here. Thus, our conclusions should be viewed as tentative as far as the total population of such projects is concerned.

TABLE 2
PERCENTAGE OF 309 (b) LOCAL IMPACT PROJECTS FUNDED, 1967-1973

Fiscal Year	Local impact projects as a % of all 309 projects funded
1973	.60
1972	.84
1971	.88
1970	.67
1969	.61
1968	.67
1967	.41

Our treatment of local impact projects begins with a description of each of the projects studied.

The Chinatown English Language Center

Grantee:	New York Chinatown Foundation, Inc.
Location:	62-64 Mott Street, New York, N.Y.
USOE Funding:	FY 1972, $40,000

An organization known as the Chinatown Advisory Council was established to coordinate various community-based civic and social programs in New York's Chinatown area. The Advisory Council was comprised of ninety-five member organizations, two-thirds of them Chinese family associations.

One of the Council's first activities was to undertake a community needs survey. The results indicated that English language instruction was a top priority need. As a consequence, an education committee was established to develop an English language program, an assignment the committee found quite difficult because of what the project director termed "red tape." Initial difficulties were overcome, however, when the Council was able to mobilize political support in its behalf. As it was then constituted, however, neither the Council nor the education committee could legally secure federal grant funds. Consequently, the Chinatown Foundation was established to receive and monitor grants. The Foundation was accountable to the

Chinatown Advisory Council.

In order to accomodate students whose working hours were quite erratic, the Center concentrated on an individualized learning approach, though some classroom instruction was also conducted. The audio-lingual approach to ESL was used, and there was a concerted effort to staff the Center with teachers who were bilingual in Chinese. The Center served about 600 students out of an estimated target population of six to eight thousand.

The English Language Learning Center was in no way part of the Title III state grant ABE program, and had no formal relationship with the New York public schools, though the project sought and received sporadic informal consulting advice from the New York City ABE program. Separation from the New York City system allowed the project to hire bilingual teachers who did not receive official staff development assistance, materials, or administrative guidance through the state Title III system. The Chinatown Learning Center had no plans to disseminate information about its activities.

The Lumbee Adult Education Project

Grantee:	The Lumbee Regional Development Association
Location:	Pembroke, North Carolina
USOE Funding:	FY 1971, $35,000; FY 1972, $135,000

According to its proposal abstract, the Lumbee Adult Education project was established to

> Equip...illiterate Lumbee Indians with the reading, writing and mathematical skills needed to solve their day-to-day problems....The students are expected to gain a new sense of self-pride and Indian identity along with their educational benefits.

The project was located in Pembroke, North Carolina, a small farming town. Unlike many other Indian tribes, the Lumbees have neither a reservation nor a tribal language. They have been living alongside whites for many years and have, by and large, culturally assimilated, although they still retain a sense of Indian identity. Most Lumbee Indians own their own land, and nearly all are small farmers. The need for ABE arises from a common syndrome of having to withdraw from school at an early age to tend farms. There are approximately 30,000 Indians in the target area, of which about 10,000 are believed to be functionally illiterate. The program served about 200 students.

The project was designed to relate to a rural population of sparse density, with all the consequent problems for ABE programs: transportation to and from classes, recruitment, and a farm-work cycle. Recruitment and in-home instruction were central concerns. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

target area was divided into six "centers," and each center maintained a class at a central location conducted by a teacher. A Lumbee paraprofessional "recruiter coach," who recruited students, served as a classroom aide, and provided in-home instruction, was also assigned to each center. If a recruiter encountered a potential student who could not attend classes, individualized materials were prescribed for at-home use, and the "recruiter coach" functioned as a tutor. Recruiter coaches also referred students to relevant social service agencies when they uncovered a need for such assistance.

All the project teachers were of Lumbee extraction because it was thought that Indian teachers would serve as success models for Indian students and that they could relate culturally to their students in ways a Caucasian teacher might find impossible. Most instructional materials were produced in-house in the belief that commercial materials were both inadequate and too expensive. The project was not associated with the local Title III program, although informal communication did occur. Some of the teachers, for example, took part in a Title III ABE staff training session, but since they did not think the experience especially worthwhile, the training relationship lapsed.

The project's most important avenue of help and assistance was Kittrell College, a small liberal arts college, which provided the project with the expertise needed to produce its own self-instructional materials. Neither the project director nor anyone on the staff was aware of other 309 (b) projects. The project did not engage in any external dissemination efforts.

Program for the Spanish-Speaking Community

Grantee: Public Schools of the District of Columbia
Location: Washington, D.C.
USOE Funding: FY 1970, $100,000; FY 1971, $125,000

The primary purpose of the Program for the Spanish-Speaking Community was to provide remedial and vocationally-oriented education to Spanish-speaking adults. ESL, computational skills, citizenship education, and consumer education were the core components of the program. In addition, the project furnished occupational and personal counseling, job placement, and social service referral assistance. A past project director estimated that 20,000 to 25,000 Spanish-speaking adults in Washington, D.C., could benefit from the services offered. The idea for the project originated with a group of Latin community leaders in 1970. A proposal was subsequently written and funded.

English classes utilized a classroom format. The basic curriculum was what the project director termed "survival English"--the colloquial English used in everyday speech. Community coordinators

were hired to form the kinds of relationships with community organizations and individuals that facilitate student recruitment and community support. Teachers were told "to make this (education) a communal venture so both students and teachers would feel that we are learning." Teachers, for example, were encouraged to "let the students teach them Spanish and to encourage the students to correct them." The project director stated, "The program got to be very popular, so much so that we were oversubscribed."

Like the other two projects studied, the project for the Spanish-speaking was in no way associated with the Title III ABE program. There was also no evidence to indicate that the project director or his staff were aware of other similar 309 (b) projects. The project did, however, form extensive linkages with universities in the Washington, D.C. area which provided voluntary consulting and evaluation help. About dissemination, the project director stated: "Dissemination as I see it is not telling about your project to other professionals, but carrying the message to the (local) people who need it." In keeping with this perspective, there was no external dissemination.

Generic Factors

A common element of the three local impact 309 (b) projects studied was their grass roots, community origin. The Chinatown English Language Learning Center, for example, was established as a result of a community needs survey. The Lumbee Adult Education Project and the Program for the Spanish-Speaking Community likewise resulted from grass roots community concern.

The fact that all three projects originated from and were partially accountable to their communities seemed to affect their orientation and focus. The Chinatown English Language Learning Center was oriented toward helping the New York Chinese; the Lumbee project focused on the educational needs of the Lumbee Indians, and the program for the Spanish-speaking was totally involved with educating Washington, D.C. Spanish-speaking Americans. In other words, the primary objective of these projects was to operate an effective educational program for a local target group--not to develop, evaluate, and disseminate a new approach to ABE, or materials, or other products for national utilization. These programs, then, were operationally rather than experimentally oriented. The major reason why none of the local impact projects disseminated is simply that dissemination was not considered to be a relevant objective under the terms of their grants.

One might ask, since these projects were operation-oriented, how did they differ from the regular Title III state grant programs? Functionally, the local impact projects studied were very like local Title III programs in that they were performing essentially similar functions, but for a special target group. The local impacts, for example, experienced problems similar to those of Title III programs--recruitment

dropouts and curriculum development. Structurally, however, the three projects exhibited major differences from the Title III programs.

Title III programs are attached to state education systems providing such aids as staff training, consulting help, and administrative direction on a routine basis. In addition, Title III programs typically develop informal networks among themselves for mutual support, assistance, and communication. The local impact projects studied were in no way part of the Title III ABE system. They were structurally isolated from it. When they did form relationships with the Title III system, the relationships were informal, sporadic, and weak.

Isolation had several consequences for the projects studied. On the negative side, isolation meant that the local impact projects were separated from the normal channels of ABE communication. When asked if he had heard of any of the well-known 309 (b) projects focusing on recruitment, one project director responded, "No I haven't," despite the fact that recruitment was a central component of his project. Similarly, when another project director was asked whether there was anything unique about her project, she answered, "Yes, I feel our learning lab is unique." She was unaware that within twenty miles there were several similar learning labs administered by Title III programs. Isolation from information means that there is nothing to prevent local impact projects from what a USOE official termed "re-creating the wheel." It may also cause these projects to experiment with approaches to ABE that have been found unpromising by other projects and Title III programs.

On the positive side, however, the local impact 309 projects were not constrained by any of the bureaucratic regulations imposed by the state education departments or public school systems. For example, the director of one project stated, "I feel that having teachers bilingual in Chinese is very important, but we have been unable to find enough teachers who have certificates." Because she was not restricted by public school regulations, the project director was able to hire bilingual teachers who had no certificates, a freedom she felt was crucial to her project's success.

This does not mean that local impact projects initially faced with isolation do not often respond by seeking outside help. The Lumbee Adult Education Project, for example, established a very productive relationship with Kittrell College in North Carolina. Kittrell provided the assistance that the Lumbee Project needed to develop its in-home instruction curriculum. Similarly, the Washinton, D.C. program for the Spanish-speaking established consulting relationships with several universities, resulting in valuable curriculum development and evaluation assistance. The point is that if a local impact project desires outside help it must search for it on its own initiative, while local Title III programs generally receive aid from the state education department on a routine basis.

All three projects studied were quite similar in their staffing patterns. In each program, priority in hiring was afforded to individuals with ethnic backgrounds similar to the project's clientele. Thus, all teachers in the Lumbee Project were Lumbee Indians, and the majority of teachers in the Washington and Chinatown projects were Latin Americans and Chinese respectively. Of the three, the Washington project placed the least emphasis on ethnicity, though it was certainly an important criterion for staffing. This staffing pattern seemed to be partially based on a belief that since the project was designed for a specific minority, it should be run by rather than for them. As the proposal abstract of the Lumbee Project asserted, "This is a project for the community, by the community." More specifically, the Lumbee Project hired Lumbee Indians exclusively, because it was felt that Indian teachers would serve as positive role models for Indian students. Another reason for hiring teachers with ethnic backgrounds similar to their students was the feeling that staff members of similar ethnicity would relate to their students on a more meaningful basis.

Because the teachers in the projects studied generally came from the same ethnic background as their students, they seemed to perceive their role to be "helping my people" rather than contributing to national ABE program development. This tended to reinforce the purely local orientation of the projects and a lack of desire to disseminate.

We now turn to the issue of dissemination. None of the local impact projects studied had disseminated its results to other ABE programs or planned to. None of their proposals specified provision for dissemination. When questioned, each project director responded primarily in terms of internal dissemination--publicizing the program to the community in order to build support and recruit students. Each project did conduct publicity efforts, utilizing such techniques as community liaison workers and publication in local newspapers; but because the project was seen as operational rather than experimental, external dissemination was considered irrelevant.

An important question is whether or not these projects produced anything that was replicable--that could be adopted elsewhere. In at least two of the three cases, replicable results were achieved. The Lumbee Project's use of paraprofessionals for recruitment, in-home instruction, and classroom instruction might benefit many rural ABE programs; and the program for Spanish-speaking people's concept of survival English might have many applications in other ESL programs. Nevertheless, there has been no dissemination of these results, perhaps in part because the project directors do not realize that they have developed innovations potentially useful to others. Moreover, there is no mechanism available to facilitate national dissemination of the results of such projects.

ISSUES AND LESSONS

As the title of this manuscript indicates, the foregoing case studies raise a number of issues regarding "Development, Demonstration, and Dissemination" of the special projects selected for research.

The present section focuses on dissemination because, in the authors' view, it is the most pressing issue both for projects themselves and for the field generally. Moreover, questions of development and demonstration tend to be closely linked to the ultimate problem of dissemination and utilization of project outcomes.

Knowledge gained from our investigation should aid planners of future R & D and dissemination activities. Problems and issues identified primarily from analysis of seven case studies may not necessarily be generalized to every R & D effort in adult education. Administrators would be wise to anticipate such problems, however, and to plan for their amelioration.

A Dissemination Strategy Should Fit the Product to be Disseminated

From the case studies, we have seen that each project studied produced a different kind of output. RFD, Communi-Link, and the local impact projects developed delivery systems, while Texas Guidance and Counseling and SWCEL produced tangible, "hard" products. Most of the products were complex in that they contained many components and required considerable user sophistication.

Dissemination is basically a communication process, and, as in all communication processes, different kinds of information warrant different modes of communication. In deciding on the mode of dissemination it is important to recognize that the user will require essentially three kinds of information: an explanation of what is to be produced, evaluative data explaining the effectiveness of the output, and use-replication data explaining how to implement it. The more complex and intangible the product, the more difficult it becomes to gather, organize, package, and convey this information. Complex products generally require face-to-face dissemination strategies where the user can interact with the developer or his representative, and in doing so secure the answers to questions of special importance to him. Similarly, the more intricate the materials, the greater is the likelihood that training and/or technical assistance will be required for use. Complex products, then, such as those developed by our case projects, require a dissemination strategy utilizing workshops, training, site visits, or extension agent visits. Simple awareness-producing strategies such as brochures or convention presentations may be helpful when used in conjunction with face-to-face methods, but alone are generally insufficient to secure adoption. It should also be noted that

in some cases products are so complicated that utilization becomes problematical. Communi-Link is a case in point. Its product, a "linked" community achieved through the Microville simulation experience, was so involved that a protracted workshop was required as well as extensive follow-up technical assistance. This expensive process meant that dissemination could be conducted only on a limited basis.

Our case projects used the dissemination strategies listed in Table 3. Each has its advantages and disadvantages.

Table 3

Dissemination Strategies Used by 309 Projects Studied

Project	Project Publications	Convention Presentations	Workshops	Commercial Publications	Teacher Training
Texas Guidance & Counseling	yes	no	yes	no	yes
RFD	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
SWCEL	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Project Communi-Link	yes	yes	yes	no	no
Local Impacts	no	no	no	no	no

Project publications are most productive when disseminating research data or when used to promote awareness of the project in conjunction with other more intensive strategies. Though publications are efficient in that they can reach many people and outlive the life of the project, it is often difficult to build comprehensive mailing lists, and of course, printing and postage are expensive.

All 309 (b) projects are required to produce final reports for USOE. Unfortunately, with one exception, inspection of the reports produced by our case projects showed that they were of little value in dissemination. That exception is the replication manual produced by RFD. A replication manual's prupose is to provide potential readers with all the information they need to utilize the output. The RFD replication manual, entitled The RFD System, furnished a detailed, well-written description of the project's output, a comprehensive and honest external evaluation of the project, and examples of some components such as the

newsletter. It failed, however, to adequately explain how a user might replicate the total system. This failure probably resulted because replication of the RFD system requires resources far beyond the reach of the manual's intended readers. Nevertheless, a user could adopt parts of the RFD system solely by reading the publication.

Convention presentations, like publications, are valuable in that they can reach large numbers of potential users in a relatively short time. They also permit a certain degree of feedback from the convention participants. Since convention presentations are generally of short duration, however, it is difficult to convey more than general awareness information. Moreover, most conventions are costly to attend, thus denying potential users from less affluent programs. A major advantage of convention presentations is that many, especially national conventions, are heavily favored by opinion leaders in the field. If these persons can be motivated by the presentations, their word-of-mouth communication can stimulate interest on the part of others.

The advantage of workshops is that, through face-to-face contact, very complex messages can be transmitted that are otherwise difficult to convey. The Communi-Link process, for example, is so involved that it is difficult to conceive its being disseminated without face-to-face contact. Another advantage to workshops is that the project can receive immediate feedback in the form of user reactions to its product or ideas. The problem with workshops is that they can reach relatively few people and are quite expensive. If workshops are conducted only for persons in the project's immediate locality, expenses are minimized, though widespread dissemination is sacrificed.

The advantages of commercial publications are that the publisher must be committed to disseminating the product if he wishes to make a profit, and that commercial dissemination generally continues after the project has terminated. Of the projects studied, only RFD commercially marketed a product. It is axiomatic that commercial publishers will not market a product unless they feel it will be profitable. This means that if products are to be published commercially, they must be sufficiently polished and attractive to preclude re-development by the publisher. RFD was able to create polished, marketable materials primarily because it could draw upon publication expertise of the associate project director and the University of Wisconsin School of Journalism. In SWCEL's case, valuable materials were not marketed because they were too costly to reproduce. Had SWCEL consulted a publisher in the beginning, it might have been possible to package the materials in a more commercially feasible form.

A disadvantage of publication is that only hard products such as curriculum materials, research reports, or training manuals are amenable to this type of dissemination. Commercial publication also

precludes distribution free of charge. Furthermore, copyright laws stipulate that releases must be secured from those whose pictures are included in filmed materials, and portions of copyrighted materials cannot be reproduced without the publisher's consent.

Teacher training was the primary strategy used by Texas Guidance and Counseling to disseminate their Teacher Awareness Kit and their Counselor Orientation Packages. Selected teachers were first oriented to the use of the packages at a workshop held at the University of Texas. These teachers then oriented others, who in turn were able to do orientation. Thus a training "snowball" process was put into operation. With the cooperation of the state education agencies in Region IV, Texas Guidance and Counseling managed to familiarize about 75 percent of the Texas ABE teachers and 90 percent of the Louisiana teachers with the packages.

The experience of Texas Guidance and Counseling indicates that the teacher training snowball process can be an extremely effective dissemination strategy on a regional basis. An advantage of this method is that state in-service education units are established, viable systems. Since dissemination channels are already established, they need only to be exploited rather than created. Also, teacher training permits the face-to-face contact that is necessary to convey complex messages. Moreover, in-service education efforts by state education departments are on-going systems which can continue to disseminate long after a particular project has disbanded. A final advantage of teacher training is that both ideas and hard products, such as materials, can be transmitted.

The Problem of Focus

Dissemination must be directed at a particular user group. At the outset of the study, the authors assumed that the user group would and should be local ABE programs, the principal client system the 309(b) program ostensibly was designed to support. Yet only one of the case projects, Texas Guidance and Counseling, effectively focused its dissemination efforts toward local ABE programs. RFD focused on policy-makers and the TV media. SWCEL's products were probably utilized more extensively in the secondary schools than in ABE. Communi-Link was directed toward the community generally, and the local impact projects did not disseminate at all. Part of the reason for this lack of direct focus on ABE programs lies in the fact that some 309 (b) projects were designed to affect local ABE programs only indirectly. If, for example, RFD had proved highly successful, it might have served as an alternative delivery system for ABE, benefiting the field although operating apart from local state grant ABE programs. Similarly, other 309 (b) projects have been funded primarily to produce data which are used by USOE in planning and policy-making.

The Problem of Relevance

Closely akin to focus is the problem of relevance. In order for dissemination to be effective, that is, to secure adoption, the product produced by the developer must be suited to, and meet the needs of, the user. Assuming that the primary intended users of 309 (b) output are local ABE programs, it is disturbing to note that only two of the projects studied, Texas Guidance and Counseling, and SWCEL, developed products meant to be used by local ABE programs. Communi-Link's product was designed for communities generally, although it was hoped that ABE programs would ultimately benefit. RFD could only be adopted by an institution with comprehensive television capability. Relevance to the user includes two components. First, the disseminated output must meet his need. It must provide a solution to a problem experienced by the user. Second, the output must be compatible with the organizational characteristics of the user system. It cannot be expected, for example, that programs operating on a shoestring will utilize a very expensive product unless the very existence of the user program is threatened by not adopting the innovation.

The Problem of Continuity

The 309 (b) projects studied were temporary systems. Once they had completed the tasks for which they were funded, they were expected to terminate. The temporal nature of 309 (b) projects has severe implications for dissemination. When the project terminates, so does dissemination because there is no longer staff or money for dissemination activities. To date, many thousands of dollars of SWCEL output rest on storage shelves in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Communi-Link's activities have ceased, and though Texas Guidance and Counseling still receives orders for its materials, they are o' a trickle compared to former days.

Shortlivedness has other implications for dissemination. Mc 309 (b) staff are hired on soft money, and not wishing to be caught without a job, often move on to other employment as termination approaches. Thus, just as the product is coming to fruition, the project experiences staffing problems. Similarly, dissemination costs money--money which must be spent near the end of the project when budgets are often most strained. Most important, however, is the fact that dissemination can only occur when the output is complete. Hence, quite often there is no time to disseminate.

Cost of Adoption

Obviously, the more a product costs to adopt, the more difficult it will be to disseminate, other factors such as the need for the product held constant. Several factors comprise cost, the most obvious

being the product price. To offset production costs, SWCEL and Texas Guidance and Counseling charged between $100 and $200 for their packages. Responses from directors of moderate-sized local ABE programs revealed that price was a problem, since purchase funds had to come from the most strained part of their line-item budgets. Price is an even greater consideration for small, less affluent programs. Cost is to some extent overcome if a product can be shared among programs. The Texas Guidance and Counseling packages, for example, may be divided and circulated.

Time spent on adopting a 309 (b) product can represent a significant cost, especially when adoption requires retraining local ABE staff. Teachers, for example, may have to be released from their teaching functions. Retraining is expensive in money as well as time.

A third cost of adoption may be organizational dislocation, or the degree to which a program must reorganize its operations in order to use a product. If an ESL program, for example, switched to the audio-lingual approach espoused by SWCEL, considerable program reorganization might be required. For a program changing from a traditional classroom approach to a learning lab approach, organizational dislocation would probably be a significant cost.

Trialability and Divisibility

Trialability refers to the user's ability to experiment with a product--to try it on a limited basis before committing the entire program to product use. Divisibility refers to the ability to use a portion of a product without having to accept the "whole package." The two concepts are quite similar.[1] In nine pilot interviews held with local ABE directors prior to construction of a survey questionnaire, a constant finding was extreme reluctance to use a product without first-hand knowledge best gained from experimentation in one's own program.

Project Communi-Link's product is not trialable. A community must totally accept or reject the concept from the beginning, and strictly speaking, it is not divisible. The packages developed by Texas Guidance and Counseling, on the other hand, are both trialable and divisible. The packages can be used by all teachers in a program or by just a few. Group use is encouraged, but individual

---

1 Concepts such as trialability and divisibility are borrowed directly from the literature on innovation diffusion. See Everett M. Rogers and E. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations (New York: Free Press, 1971).

use is possible, and the packages are organized in self-contained modules.

Modifiability

Modifiability refers to the ability of a local program to adapt a product to unique aspects of the local situation. ABE programs are found in many different settings. Instructional techniques vary, as does the target population served. If a product cannot be adapted to the local situation (should adaptation be necessary), national dissemination is precluded. The packages developed by Texas Guidance and Counseling are quite modifiable. They were significantly modified in Louisiana to take account of the large French-speaking population, a fact that contributed to a reported 90 percent use rate by teachers in that state.

In contrast, the RFD television programs were criticized for their lack of modifiability. Since each taped program contained references to specific local names and places, each would have to be edited for use elsewhere. Complex technological equipment is required for editing, however, making adaptation difficult and expensive.

Motivation and Ability to Disseminate

Motivation and ability to disseminate are two obvious preconditions to any successful dissemination effort. Yet we found that many 309 (b) projects possess neither characteristic. Most fall within the general category of local impact projects. They are not motivated to disseminate because they perceive their primary mission to be the operation of an on-going educational program rather than the demonstration of a new practice. Moreover, they are typically isolated from local ABE programs and other 309 (b) projects and are thus unaware that their outcomes could be of value to others. Since many local impact projects operate on marginal budgets, they do not have the resources to disseminate even if they desire to.

With the absence of strong Office of Education (or state education department) incentives, 309 (b)-type projects cannot be expected to disseminate more than they have to date. The problem is that government agencies cannot require dissemination without making funding provisions for it. Given the fact that approximately fifty projects have been funded per year in recent years, funding individual project dissemination efforts would be prohibitively expensive. Moreover, the skills and interests needed for effective dissemination are often different from those required for effective project development.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE: A PERMANENT DISSEMINATION SYSTEM

Each year many millions of dollars are spent for research, development, and demonstration in adult education. Yet the results of this extensive effort are relatively worthless unless they are made known and used. These case studies, and other research conducted by the authors, have highlighted some of the problems of dissemination and utilization and serve to indicate that their resolution has been less than satisfactory. How then might dissemination and utilization become more effective?

We have noted that the projects which have been responsible for the dissemination of R & D output are temporary systems. When funding terminates so does dissemination. Thus, the first step in increasing dissemination and utilization should be the establishment of a permanent, fully funded dissemination system to store, evaluate, and continue to disseminate R & D output long after the original producers have left the scene.[1]

We have also suggested that effective dissemination is no simple matter, requiring considerable expertise. Strategies that fit the product and the special characteristics of the intended users must be designed, planned for, and executed. One way of increasing the probability that projects would develop optimally effective dissemination strategies would be to urge them strongly to collaborate with the permanent system when designing activities. Consultants from the permanent system might assist projects to develop viable dissemination strategies during the initial phases of project operation. If it were then determined that the project would undertake its own dissemination, plans could be made for phasing this function into the permanent system as project termination approached. If the project did not wish to undertake its own dissemination, or lacked the means, plans could be established for having the permanent system do so as soon as the product was completed.

Occasionally, R & D projects develop products which have great promise but are in some way lacking. Perhaps, for example, no time remains for field testing or for adequate packaging. In such cases the permanent system might perform an "adaptive development" function, arranging for necessary modifications or for further development as a prelude to dissemination. Likewise, such a system might perform a discovery function, identifying and disseminating valuable project output and other relevant innovations which would otherwise go unnoticed.

---

[1]For a more detailed description of such a system, see Gordon G. Darkenwald, Harold W. Beder, and Aliza K. Adelman, Problems of Dissemination and Use of Innovations in Adult Basic Education (New York: Center for Adult Education, Columbia University, 1974).

We have continuously stressed that dissemination is necessary for utilization, but not sufficient. For adoption to occur, a product must meet a potential user's felt needs and must take the user's organizational constraints into account. The permanent system could provide a valuable service by dispatching "extension agents" to visit local programs in order to register needs and then retrieve products which could realistically meet those needs. In the same regard, we have noted that most R & D products in adult education are complex to the point that face-to-face contact with the potential user is a precondition of effective dissemination. A complex product, for example, generally requires training in its use. The "extension agent" could provide in-depth face-to-face explanation and training or technical assistance when needed.

We have defined an effective dissemination system as one that is able to secure a high degree of utilization for the products it transmits. Obviously, however, if a dissemination system achieves use of worthless or deleterious outputs it creates more harm than good. Thus evaluation of products should be a central function of the permanent system. Two kinds of evaluation are important. First, materials should be evaluated as to their substance or content. Is the product professionally sound, well-conceived, and developed? Will it truly benefit adult education? Field testing or the judgment of experts can provide these answers. Second, products should be evaluated as to their use potential or marketability. Persons who have utilized the product might be contacted for their opinion, or a limited pilot dissemination effort might be undertaken to see if a wider effort is warranted.

Our final observation is not a new one but rather a reiteration of our central theme. Research and demonstration projects and other agencies involved in dissemination must concentrate on securing use of their outcomes rather than merely telling people about them. Dissemination is like shooting an arrow. Unless the arrow is aimed at a target and strikes it, there is no score.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Other recent Occasional Papers of Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education:

41. THE SYRACUSE BLACK COMMUNITY, 1970: A COMPARATIVE STUDY, by Seymour Sacks and Ralph Andrew. 1974, $3.00, with University College.
40. THE USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION IN ADULT EDUCATION: A REVIEW OF SOME RECENT DEVELOPMENTS, by Robert J. Blakely. 1974, $1.50, with ERIC/AE.
39. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION IN ITS CULTURAL AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIMENSION: A SELECTED LITERATURE REVIEW OF PUBLIC TELEVISION AS AN ISSUE IN ADULT EDUCATION, by Robert A. Carlson. 1973, $2.00, with ERIC/AE.
38. EVALUATING THE ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES IN ADULT EDUCATION: PROCESS, PROPERTIES, PROBLEMS, PROSPECTS, by Sara M. Steele and Robert E. Brack. 1973, $2.25, with ERIC/AE.
37. ADULT EDUCATION IN CHURCH AND SYNAGOGUE: A REVIEW OF SELECTED RECENT LITERATURE, by Huey B. Long. 1973, $2.50, with ERIC/AE.
36. TOWARD A WORKING PHILOSOPHY OF ADULT EDUCATION, by Jerold W. Apps. 1973, $3.00, with ERIC/AE.
35. CONCEPTUAL LEARNING: FROM MOLLUSKS TO ADULT EDUCATION, by Robert A. Carlson. 1973, $1.75, with ERIC/AE.
34. CONSUMER EDUCATION PROGRAMMING IN CONTINUING EDUCATION, by Margaret Charters. 1973, $1.75, with ERIC/AE.
33. THE CHALLENGE OF MODERN CHURCH-PUBLIC RELATIONS, ed. by Michael V. Reagen and Doris S. Chertow. 1972, $3.00.
32. PAULO FREIRE: A REVOLUTIONARY DILEMMA FOR THE ADULT EDUCATOR, ed. by Stanley M. Grabowski. 1972, $4.00.
31. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL INFLUENCES UPON THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESIDENTIAL CENTERS FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION, by Frank W. Jessup. 1972, $1.50.
30. TOWARD GOG AND MAGOG OR?: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE OF ADULT GROUP DISCUSSION, by Osinski, Ohliger, et al. 1972, $3.00, with ERIC/AE.
29. AGENDA FOR COMPARATIVE STUDIES IN ADULT EDUCATION: REPORT FROM THE INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS MEETING, 1972, $2.00.
28. RESPONSE TO NEED: A CASE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION GRADUATE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOUTHEAST, by Charles E. Kozoll. 1972, $2.25.
27. THE HILL AND THE VALLEY: THE STORY OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY THROUGH 1964, by A.N. Charters. 1972, $2.25.
26. REAL ESTATE TAX EXEMPTION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS, by A.N. Charters. 1972, $1.00.
25. THE LEARNING FORCE: A MORE COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY, by Stanley Moses. 1971, $1.25.
24. LIFELONG LEARNING OR LIFELONG SCHOOLING?: A TENTATIVE VIEW OF THE IDEAS OF IVAN ILLICH WITH A QUOTATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY, by John Ohliger and Coleen McCarthy. 1971, $2.25, with ERIC/AE.

Order from: Publications in Continuing Education, Syracuse University, 224 Huntington Hall, Syracuse, New York 13210.